

Concordia

Theological Monthly

Vol. VIII

JULY, 1937

No. 7

The Pastor and Intracongregational Organizations

Little has been written on the history of intracongregational societies, except with reference to young people's societies. The ladies' aid is the oldest society within the congregations of our synodical organization. Then follows the young people's society (or societies) and, more recently, the men's club. Some congregations with parish-schools have a parent-teachers' organization and in connection with it a preschool mothers' circle. To the parent-teachers' organization any communicant member of the congregation may belong; but generally only the parents who have children in the parish-school take out membership in this organization. The membership of the preschool mothers' circle is limited to the mothers in the congregation who have children of preschool age or such as are in the first or second grade of the school. Not many congregations with parish-schools have organized these two latter societies. Still fewer congregations have an alumni association, composed of graduates of the parish-school. There are congregations within our Synod who have also boy-scout troops.

The present essay is to deal not with the history of intracongregational societies nor with their work in general, but is to give some thought to the pastor and to intracongregational organizations.

The pastor ought never to forget, nor ought he to permit the societies within the congregation to lose sight of the fact, that the congregation is a divinely ordained institution. It is God's will that those of the same faith living in the community gather together for public worship and the administration of the Sacraments. The writer of the Letter to the Hebrews admonishes the Christians: "Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is," Heb. 10, 25. "The Christian is to maintain all possible worshiping union with the brethren of the faith, in the dawning light of the promised return of the now enthroned High Priest."

(H. C. G. Moule, *Messages from the Epistle to the Hebrews.*) In praise of the congregation at Jerusalem Luke mentions the fact that the Christians there "continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship and in breaking of bread and in prayers," Acts 2, 42. In so doing, they were pleasing God and doing their *God-given* duty as Christians. The Christians are urged to participate in the celebration of the Lord's Supper with their brethren of the faith, not only for the strengthening of their faith and for their increase in Christian love, but also as a public testimony of the communion of faith, 1 Cor. 10, 17; 11, 17—21. 33. The Christians are *duty-bound*, through the insistent command of God's Word, to practise Christian fellowship for the building up and edification of the body of Christ; to "teach and admonish one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs," Col. 3, 16; to incite one another to faith and good works, Heb. 10, 24; to use their several gifts for the general good of the congregation, Eph. 4, 15. 16. The erring brother is to be admonished not only by his fellow-Christians, but by the *church*, and as the context shows, this means the *local congregation*, Matt. 18, 17. According to God's will there is to be a local congregation for the upbuilding of the spiritual life of the Christians through Word and Sacrament, for brotherly encouragement and admonition, for the practise of Christian church discipline, and for the exercise of Christian charity.

When new members were added to the congregation at Jerusalem through the preaching and teaching of the Gospel, we are told that the Lord added to the church at Jerusalem daily such as should be saved, Acts 2, 47 b.

We have, of course, also the example of the apostles for the founding of Christian congregations, and certainly the apostles did this in keeping with God's will and as an example for future generations to follow. As one reads the New Testament, one cannot escape the conviction that the New Testament regards it as *self-evident* that Christian faith and love and the desire of Christian fellowship will urge the Christians to seek Christian communion and spiritual strengthening by uniting with those of the same faith in the community in the holy fellowship of the Word and Sacraments, in prayer and mutual encouragement, and in the building and extension of the kingdom of God. The Christians in all ages of New Testament history showed their desire for spiritual communion and fellowship by founding Christian congregations.

As congregations exist according to God's will, thus the ministry of the Word (*Pfarramt*) exists according to God's will. Apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers are *God's gift to the Church* for the edification of the body of Christ, Eph. 4, 11,

and God has given specific instructions regarding the qualifications of bishops and elders, 1 Tim. 3, 2-7; Titus 1, 6 ff. Paul makes it the *duty* of Timothy to care for the preservation of the ministry. "The things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also," 2 Tim. 2, 2. The elders of the congregation at Ephesus were told by Paul that the *Holy Ghost* had made them overseers of the congregation, Acts 20, 28.

Although the ministry of the Word is established according to Christ's will, it is left to the wisdom of the congregation, on the basis of its individual needs, to confer all the duties and functions of the office upon one person or to establish offices to assist the pastor by properly qualified men and women and to assign to them specific duties and work, Eph. 4, 11; 1 Tim. 5, 17. The office of the ministry is a divine institution, but the organization of auxiliary offices in the congregation is left to the wisdom of the congregation. When the circumstances demanded it, the congregation at Jerusalem elected deacons for the discharge of the specific duty of caring for the poor in its midst, thereby relieving the apostles, Acts 6, 1. See also "The Organization of the Church" in Foakes-Jackson's *The History of the Christian Church*, p. 209 ff. See also Walther, *Brosamen*, p. 349 ff.

The assembly, or congregation, of Christians who have united for the purpose of having the Word of God preached and the Sacraments administered to them by a pastor or pastors whom the congregation has called exists by divine right. The pastor or pastors of the congregation by the call of the congregation are the shepherds and overseers of the flock and through the call of the congregation are divinely charged with the care of the souls within the congregation.

But how the congregation itself is to be organized, which officers it is to have and which organizations are to be allowed to exist in its midst, is left to time and circumstances and to the wisdom of the congregation.

Important practical conclusions must be drawn from this doctrinal basis.

The congregation is the only divinely ordained institution. Therefore the formation of organizations within the congregation cannot be made a matter of conscience to the pastor and the congregation. A pastor and a congregation may well take care of the spiritual welfare of the members without the formation of *separate organizations*. The mere existence of many intracongregational organizations does not in itself indicate spiritual progress, nor is it a guarantee of spiritual growth and of a high degree of spiritual activity and advancement of the kingdom of God. When there

were no men's clubs, the congregational meeting of the voters was used for doctrinal discussion and the furtherance of Christian understanding and zeal for the Lord's work, and in the early history of our Synod these meetings were well attended by the voting members. At that time there was also a more general and frequent interchange of visits of the members, especially also the youth, in their respective homes, and at such visits doctrinal discussions and consideration of the welfare of the congregation and the Church at large were not anomalies. One has reason to believe that also the pastoral care and cure of souls was practised to a larger extent, and that private reading of the Bible and family worship were more generally engaged in, than at present. The influence of the home in those days of the simple life was greater than today, and the need of intracongregational societies was not apparent.

We must guard against overestimating intracongregational societies as a boon for the church and a sign of progress, and we must refrain from loveless criticism of the congregations of the past who did not maintain many intracongregational societies and of the congregations of the present day who sincerely endeavor to take care of the spiritual needs of young and old without resorting to the formation of *organizations* for all groups and ages. But though the formation of intracongregational organizations cannot be made a matter of conscience, the *proper spiritual care* of all age groups certainly is a matter of conscience for pastor and congregation. The formation of intracongregational organizations is an adiaphoron, but the proper spiritual care of the souls of the congregation certainly is not.

The congregation is the only divinely ordained institution. All intracongregational societies are of human origin. Certainly the congregation, in the exercise of its Christian liberty and prompted by Christian wisdom, has the right to organize societies within its midst if it believes that circumstances make a new organization expedient and that through such an organization the best interests and true aims of the congregation are not hindered, but *organizationally* better served. For reasons which may well prompt a congregation to do organized young people's work see *Walther League Manual*, pp. 5. 6.

Before an organization can be formed within the congregation, the congregation itself, through the male membership, to which, according to the Lord's own arrangement, 1 Tim. 2, 11. 12; 1 Cor. 14, 34. 35, has been entrusted the rule in the congregation, must give its permission. This is to be done not carelessly, but after due consideration and upon the conviction that the organization serves a real need and will constitute a blessing. The mere fact that organizations within the congregation may present a danger (ec-

clesiola in ecclesia) is not in itself sufficient reason to deny the permission, if ways and means can be devised which make it reasonably sure that with God's blessing the danger can be avoided.

As the congregation must give permission for the organization of any society within its midst, the *congregation* remains responsible for the work and activities of these organizations and has the right and duty of exercising proper control over these organizations. "The congregation is the real seat of authority, in so far as its own total life and work are concerned. To it therefore belongs ultimate control—not to the pastor, not to any other person, not to any group within it or outside it. There is no power that can rightfully take from the congregation itself its right or its responsibility to control its own affairs, all of them. . . . Accordingly, the plan of administration must, if it is to be true to Lutheran church polity, give to the congregation final administrative control of everything in its life." (*Our Congregation and Its Work*, by Paul E. Keyser.) It is therefore wholly proper that the congregation ask for reports on the work and activities of the intracongregational societies and that it delegate to some one or some committee (pastor and church board) the control and guidance of the intracongregational organizations.

It may be well for us as pastors to ask ourselves whether there is any real *unity* in the administration of the work of the congregation as a whole, whether, for all practical purposes, the intracongregational organizations are independent organizations or really under the direct administration of the congregation.

In most congregations the church board, or church council, or vestry—is the administrative, or executive, body charged by the congregation with supervision of all the work in the congregation. In some instances the church council is composed of the elders and trustees and the members of the board of education, in other instances only of the pastor, the elders, and the trustees. But also in the latter case the vestry and the board of Christian education, which supervises the work of the day-school and Sunday-school, naturally hold periodic meetings for mutual consultation and discussion regarding the welfare of child education. But apart from the supervision and guidance which the pastor gives, assisted in many instances by the parish-school teachers, which method of guidance and supervision and control does the congregation employ through the church council for the intracongregational societies?

"Naturally, in most situations, this total administration is too large a task for the church council and the pastor to handle effectively alone. Some further administrative provision is usually

necessary. This may be of various kinds. For example, to mention but a few possibilities, the council may work through a staff of paid directors, or through committees, or through a cabinet composed of all the officers of the church and of its various organizations, or through a workers' conference, which includes every worker in the congregation, or through any combination of these. These assisting bodies, whatever they may be, may be selected in a number of ways: by the congregation, by the council, by the organizations, by each of these — congregation, council, organizations — selecting a number of representatives, and so on. The subject is not what kind of assisting administrative body there shall be nor how this body can best be selected, but that some such body is very necessary if the administration of the congregation is to reach every nook and corner of the church's life with helpfulness, guidance, and control."

It goes without saying that the control which the congregation exercises through the church board and assisting committees over the intracongregational societies is not to be autocratic and domineering, but thoroughly democratic, in keeping with the fundamental nature of the Christian Church.

The plan of administration should make provision for consultation and conference with the officers of the societies. The committees which have charge of the guidance of the intracongregational societies together with the church council ought to have a few meetings a year with the officers of the societies, separately or together, for mutual discussion and for working out a *unified program of work*.

This leads us to a discussion of the *program* of intracongregational societies.

Since the congregation is the only divinely ordained institution in the congregation, it must appear self-evident that the program of intracongregational societies must be in harmony with the program of the congregation and that the only reason for the existence of such societies must be the purpose of helping the congregation effectively to reach its God-given aims and carry on its God-appointed work. There must be *unity of aim and work*.

The aim of the congregation is the furtherance of its members in faith and good works and the winning of further souls. To be helpful to the congregation in the realization of its aims the intracongregational societies, if they are worthy of existence, must make provision for an educational program and a program of church-work and service. The complete program of the society includes also worship and fellowship. Each meeting of the society ought to be opened with a brief devotion, consisting of the singing of a hymn, a Scripture-reading, and prayer. It is not necessary that

the pastor always lead these devotions, but for the development of leadership it may be well to have members of the society appointed to lead these devotions. The educational program may include the following: Bible-study, doctrinal essays, topics dealing with the work of the Church in general and missions in particular. The *Walther League Manual* lists the following under its program of Christian Knowledge: topic studies (the world, the Church, the local congregation, personal life), debates, open forums, lectures, Bible-studies, lectures on the Bible, illustrated lectures, mission-studies, methods of soul-winning, mission-plays, etc. (See *Walther League Manual*, pp. 131—222.) Under the title of Christian Service we find the following: missionary endeavor, soul-winning, canvassing, hospitality, soul-keeping, travelers, publicity, road markers, window displays, newspapers, public libraries, division of welfare, cheer, social service, poor relief, unemployment relief, Wheat Ridge promotion, etc. (See *Walther League Manual*, pp. 227—285.)

When we speak of *fellowship*, let us not forget that the Christians practise the holiest type of fellowship when they join in prayer, in meditation upon God's Word, and in joint endeavors for the promotion of the kingdom of God. The recreational fellowship, if it is kept on the high plane prescribed by Christian principles, is indeed wholesome and has a place on the program of the societies, but dare never become the chief, much less the only, reason for the existence of these organizations. "It is always better to begin . . . with small numbers rather than with low ideals."

In order that the whole program of the intracongregational societies be *integrated and correlated with the program of the congregation* and that the program of all groups form a balanced unity, it is necessary that the church board at the end of the year meet with the officers of the societies to work out a unified program of education and Christian service. If, for instance, the congregation wishes to center its work for the year upon the introduction of the family altar into the homes of the congregation, this aim of the congregation ought to find a prominent place in the educational program of the societies, and the societies ought to be willing to cooperate with their resources of money and members to help the congregation reach its aim. If each society is allowed to work independently, there will be much overlapping and a lack of striving to reach a common goal.

The congregation is a divine institution. This truth the pastor must keep vividly in mind and not permit the members of his congregation to lose sight of this fact. The congregation must remain *first* in the thought and interest of the members of the societies within the congregation. The societies and their work dare never overshadow in importance the work of the congregation as

such. Membership in an intracongregational society must not be regarded as a substitute for church-membership. The first duty of the members of the men's club and ladies' aid and young people's societies is not the attendance at the meetings of their respective society, but the attendance at the services in the sanctuary. The members of the men's club should realize that attendance at the business meeting of the voting members takes precedence of the attendance at the club meeting. The young men of the Walther League must know that, when they are twenty-one years of age, they ought to become voting members of the congregation. If a member cannot find time to hold office both in the congregation proper and in a society within the church, his first duty is toward the congregation. If the members of the societies cannot pay both congregational and society dues, congregational dues must come first; for without a congregation there would be no intracongregational societies. It is important that the pastor stress these points in the meetings of the intracongregational societies.

Since the congregation is the only divinely ordained institution, it cannot be made a matter of conscience to a member of the congregation to affiliate himself with a society within the congregation.

The pastor must have a clear conception of the high dignity and the sovereign rights of the congregation and the proper relation of the intracongregational societies to the congregation if he is to take the right attitude to these societies.

As the congregation is the divinely ordained institution, the pastor cannot permit his time to be so engrossed with the meetings and work of the societies as to neglect his *chief* work in the congregation, the conscientious preparation of his sermons, the development of his own spiritual life, his fellowship with God in the upper room, his private study, his cure of souls (*Privatseelsorge*), his mission-work. If he cannot find time to do all the work, including the supervision of the societies and the attending of all its meetings, and the congregation is not financially able to provide specially trained help, he must delegate in the first place some of the work with the societies to properly instructed and trained and able lay leaders.

The pastor is the divinely called shepherd of the souls of the congregation. Therefore, by virtue of his office, he is the leader of the congregation. This means that the societies within the congregation should accept and respect his leadership. This means that the pastor cannot evade the responsibility of lending his efforts and influence to the proper organization and functioning of the societies within the congregation, so that the congregation is not hindered, but helped in the realization of its God-given aims and

opportunities by the intracongregational societies. The pastor is, and will remain, the key-man in the congregational set-up. The pastor ought to take a sympathetic and active interest in the work of the societies. Only in this way can he hope to gain and hold the cooperation of congregational societies. If the members know, and are made to feel, that their pastor regards their societies as a "necessary evil," that he only "tolerates" their existence, and that he believes that no possible good can be accomplished by them, the pastor need not be surprised if he must complain of a lack of cooperation on the part of the officers of the societies. As a general rule, the members of our societies are only too glad to seek the counsel and active support, and are happy to have the guidance and supervision, of a pastor who shows intelligent and sympathetic understanding of their aims and their work. It certainly is contrary to the Scriptural position which the pastor occupies in the congregation if a society within the congregation believes that the pastor has no business to attend its meetings and to guide and supervise it in its endeavors and work. If societies seek to do things behind the pastor's back and show an unwillingness to accept a pastor's advice and suggestions, they do not take the proper and Scriptural attitude to him whom the congregation has called as its shepherd and leader.

A word may not be amiss regarding the pastor's attitude toward affiliation of his societies with the Walther League or the Lutheran Laymen's League. Like Synod, these organizations do not wish to set themselves up as a supergovernment over the congregations and the societies. They wish to be only *service organizations*, *helpful agencies*, to assist the pastor and the individual societies in carrying on their work in a most efficient manner. In our humble opinion pastors ought to welcome the assistance which these organizations, with their program of Christian Knowledge and Christian Service, offer in order to make the work of the societies really worth while and worthy of the name of a church organization.

In this connection one always stumbles upon the question of dues. In the first place, let us seriously ask ourselves if the members of the society do not receive a dollar's worth of service for the dues which they pay to the extracongregational organization. Personally we are convinced that they do. In the second place, do we believe that, if the members of the society would not pay their dollar a year to the extracongregational organization, that the congregation would receive that extra dollar in church dues or contributions for the work of Synod? Or do we believe that, if the young people would not spend the money for Walther League rallies and conventions, a like amount would flow into the congre-

gational treasury? We believe the answers must be in the negative. We believe that it is poor policy to harp upon, and show dissatisfaction with, the expense connected with membership in the extracongregational organizations; but we ought rather to use our influence and station for the better inculcation of a deeper sense of the stewardship of money. The lack of generosity in the support of the congregation and Synod cannot be found in the support which the societies give to the extracongregational organizations, but to the weak understanding and half-hearted practise of Christian stewardship.

Must we as pastors insist upon the synodizing of these extracongregational organizations? In the first place, let us remember that these extracongregational organizations like the Walther League came into existence because Synod as such did not see fit to give to these societies the service helps and guidance which were felt to be necessary. In the second place, we must remember that, although the congregation, as a divinely ordained institution, has a right and a duty to control all societies in its midst, Synod as an organization of human origin cannot rightfully lay claim to the right and duty of controlling all organizations functioning within its confines and membership. Whether these organizations should be synodized is therefore a matter of wisdom and human expediency on which opinions may well differ. There are arguments on both sides. *Organizationally* it would be a more simple set-up if Synod as Synod would conduct works of benevolence and institutions for higher education of the laity and in an advisory capacity would assist the congregations in the work of men's clubs, ladies' aids, and young people's societies. As it is, these extrasynodical organizations are guided and supervised in their work by committees which Synod appoints or elects, and, as far as we have knowledge, the organizations have always shown themselves willing to accept this synodical supervision and have welcomed the assistance and advice of the synodical board or committee.

In regard to parent-teachers' organizations the pastor will be called upon to face the issue whether it is wise for this congregational society to join the local, State, and national P. T. A. Our own observation leads us to the conclusion that the pastor would do well *not* to advocate this affiliation. The State and national P. T. A. as an organization makes propaganda and works for the passing of laws regarding divorce, child labor, recreation, and education. Would it be wise or even right for a *church* organization to engage in political propaganda and political activity? No doubt some benefits could be derived by the congregational parent-teachers' organization, especially in reference to setting up its educational program, by affiliation with the P. T. A.; but the church

group could not join the P. T. A. in its political activities and remain true to the principle of the separation of State and Church.

Uppermost in our mind while we considered the subject of the pastor and intracongregational activities was the truth which should never be pushed into the background that the congregation is the divinely ordained institution. In every intracongregational organization and work our energies must be directed clearly and sharply to the presentation of a program and for the execution of work which will be a direct help to our congregational life. "It is, after all, the local congregation which pours into that section of the world immediately surrounding it the power of the Word of God and the continuing love of the world's Redeemer. If the congregation does not fulfil that obligation, or if it is too weakly and carelessly organized, the kingdom of God cannot prosper in that place. In the final analysis the voice of the Church means only the voice of the individual congregations, and the strength of the Church is no greater and no smaller than the strength of the individual congregation." (*Walther League Manual*, p. 12.)

Furthermore there was uppermost in our mind the Scriptural truth that the pastor is the divinely called leader in the congregation and the shepherd of the souls entrusted to his care by the loving hand of the Savior. Only as he is faithful to the stupendous and yet glorious tasks and duties which are his by divine appointment, can the congregation as such and the societies within the congregation as an integral part of the congregation and its work prosper and successfully meet their problems and their opportunities.

Bloomington, Ill.

WALTER E. HOHENSTEIN

Das Datum der Verabfassung des Johannesevangeliums

In einer Rezension von *Fahlings Life of Christ* im „Kirchenblatt“ (A. L. C.) schreibt F. Braun: „Die Annahme, daß das Johannesevangelium erst kurz vor Ende des ersten Jahrhunderts geschrieben wurde, ist heutzutage nicht mehr haltbar.“ Ist diese Behauptung haltbar?

Während sich in den verschiedenen Einleitungen zum Johannesevangelium und in den mancherlei Untersuchungen über das Johannesevangelium allerdings eine große Verschiedenheit zeigt, so zeigt sich doch auch bei genauerer Untersuchung sehr bald, daß man die verschiedenen Schriftsteller auf diesem Gebiet in gewisse Gruppen einteilen kann. Das *fundamentum dividendi* der Stellung zu Gottes Wort gibt uns im allgemeinen die beste Einteilung, nämlich die der negativen und der positiven Kritiker. Wir könnten hier allerdings zurückgreifen in den

Anfang des letzten Jahrhunderts, als Wegscheider in ſeiner „Einleitung in das Evangelium des Johannes“ (1806) ſich ſo ausdrückte: „Nach allem dieſem ſcheint ſich folgendes als Reſultat beſtimmen zu laſſen: Die wahrſcheinlichere Angabe bleibt die, daß das Johanneſevangelium in der Zeit zwiſchen 68 und 70 oder, wie es noch richtiger ſein möchte, wenn man die Zeit ſeines Exils unter Nero ſetzt, in den Jahren 70 bis 80 abgefaßt ſei, wo die irrigen Anſichten, auf welche er ſich im Evangelium zu beziehen ſcheint, ſchon als bekannt angenommen werden können, nach dem Tode der Apoſtel Petrus und Paulus.“ (S. 199.)

Mit dem Aufblühen der Tübinger Schule regte ſich der Geiſt des extremen Rationalismus in einer Weiſe, die aller theologiſchen Nüchternheit Hohn ſprach. Nach der Baurſchen Behauptung konnte das Evangelium nicht vor der zweiten Hälfte des zweiten Jahrhunderts entſtanden ſein und darum auch nicht Johannes den Apoſtel zum Verfaſſer haben. Deſwegen finden wir, daß viele Theologen, in Deutschland ſowohl wie in andern europäiſchen Ländern, im Bruſtstone vollſter Überzeugung von einer ſehr ſpäten Verabſaffung des Johanneſevangeliums reden, wie z. B. Scholten (1867), Wittichen (1868) und andere. Immer wieder begegnen wir den Mutmaßungen, daß das vierte Evangelium erſt um 170 oder 180 entſtanden ſei. Wie es ſcheint, verſchlug es zunächſt nicht viel, daß z. B. Schneider (Die Echtheit des johanneiſchen Evangeliums, 1854) ſchrieb: „So glauben wir denn, zu der Aufſtellung des Schlußreſultats berechtigt zu ſein: daß die äußeren Zeugniſſe, für ſich betrachtet, der Authentie des Evangeliums durchaus günſtig ſind, auf alle Fälle aber die Baurſche Annahme von einer Abfaſſung des Evangeliums um das Jahr 170 n. Chr. eine durch und durch unhistoriſche, den Zeugniſſen widerſtreitende iſt.“ (S. 60 f.) Hatte doch auch ſchon Crome in ſeiner gekrönten Preiſſchrift *Probabilia haud probabilia* Bretſchneiders Angriffe auf das Johanneſevangelium vollſtändig entkräftet. Die negativen Kritiker brachten es fertig, immer neue Munition zu finden oder — zu fabrizieren.

Um die johanneiſche Verfaſſerſchaft des vierten Evangeliums in Zweifel zu ziehen und die Möglichkeit der Verabſaffung des Buches gegen Ende des erſten Jahrhunderts außer Frage zu ſetzen, benutzte man beſonders den Einwurf, daß der Apoſtel Johannes ſchon im Jahre 44 den Märtyrertod erlitten hätte. Dieſes Datum wurde von Schwarz als ſicher angenommen (Tod der Söhne Zebedäi, 1904) und ſofort auch von Wellhauſen verteidigt. Die Theorie des frühen Märtyrums des Johannes war bis vor kurzem bei radikalen Kritikern ſehr beliebt, denn wir finden ſie bei Pfleiderer, Bouſſet, Joannes Weiß, Menzies, Züllicher, Schmiedel, Loiſh, Moffatt, Burkitt, Bacon und andern. Man ſtützt ſich bei dieſer Hypotheſe auf eine falſche Schlußfolgerung auf Grund von Matth. 20, 23 und Mark. 10, 39, auf ein Mißverſtändnis der Worte eines gewiſſen Georgius Hamartolos aus dem neunten Jahrhundert und

auf die (sicher nicht schwerwiegende) Tatsache, daß in alten Kirchenealendern die Bebedaiden zusammen genannt werden als Märtyrer.

Diesen Theorien aber steht entgegen, daß schon Harnack, der doch gewiß kein blinder Konservativer war, nach jahrelangem Studium der Frage erklärte: „Nicht vor dem Jahre 80 und nicht nach dem Jahre 110.“ (Chronologie, 680.) Und selbst Schmiedel mußte im Jahre 1906 zugestehen, daß der Zeitpunkt um die Jahrhundertwende schwerwiegende Gründe für sich hat. Ähnlich stand Overbeck im Jahre 1911. In der bekannten „Einleitung“ von Appel (1922) schreibt der Verfasser: „So bleibt man am besten bei der Jahrhundertwende stehen.“ (S. 213.) Im Jahre 1922 gab auch Vert seine Untersuchung über das Evangelium des Johannes heraus, in dem er sich für Johannes, den Bebedaiden, als Verfasser entscheidet und die Zeit der Verabfassung in das Greisenalter des Apostels legt. Es sei auch noch hingewiesen auf Streeter (*The Four Gospels*, 1925), der trotz seiner wesentlich negativen Stellung sich der Überzeugung nicht entziehen kann, daß das vierte Evangelium „in the Greek city of Ephesus“ entstanden sei, und zwar „about A. D. 90“. (S. 370 f.)

Nehmen wir nun eine weitere Gruppe von Zeugen, die uns in ihrer Stellung zur Schrift etwas mehr sympathisch sind. Godet (1869), der sich für die Verabfassung gegen Ende des ersten Jahrhunderts entscheidet, schreibt einleitend: „Die Kirchenbäter sind einstimmig der Ansicht, Johannes habe während seines Aufenthaltes in Kleinasien geschrieben, nicht, als er noch in Palästina weilte.“ Er weist hin auf das Zeugnis des Irenäus (*Adv. Haer.*, III, 1): „Darauf (nach den drei andern Evangelisten) hat auch Johannes, der Jünger des Herrn, der an seiner Brust lag, ebenfalls das Evangelium veröffentlicht, während er zu Ephesus in Asien wohnte.“ Chrysostomus pflichtet dieser Ansicht bei; auch Hieronymus scheint sie zu teilen. Godet weist auch hin auf den Bericht im Pseudoathanasius (*Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae*): „Das Evangelium des Johannes ist von ihm . . . während seiner Verbannung auf die Insel Patmos diktiert und durch den teuren Gajus, den Gastfreund der Apostel, in Ephesus herausgegeben worden.“ Wenn auch die Verabfassung des Evangeliums auf der Insel Patmos schon aus sprachlichen Gründen sehr unwahrscheinlich ist, so spricht doch auch dieser Bericht für die Ansetzung der Zeit gegen Ende des Jahrhunderts. Godet sagt schließlich von den Kirchenbätern: „Daraus sowie aus der Versicherung, daß es in Asien abgefaßt worden sei, ergibt sich unstreitig, daß sie seine Entstehung ziemlich spät im ersten Jahrhundert setzen, da der Aufenthalt des Johannes in diesen Gegenden den Abschluß seiner Laufbahn bildet.“ (S. 56.)

Von großem Interesse sind auch die Ergebnisse der Untersuchungen Zahns in seiner gründlichen „Einleitung in das Neue Testament“ (1907). Er faßt seine Ausführungen zusammen in die Aussagen: „Die Untersuchung des Nachtrags hat ergeben, daß dieser und somit

das ganze Buch nicht nach dem Jahre 100 geschrieben sein kann, womit alle kirchliche Tradition übereinstimmt, welcher auch die alten Bestreiter der Echtheit des vierten Evangeliums nicht zu widersprechen gewagt haben. . . . Dazu kommt die Untersuchung des Verhältnisses von Kap. 1—20 zu den Synoptikern, deren Ergebnisse uns zwingen, für die Abfassung des ganzen Buchs bis zum Jahre 75, wahrscheinlicher bis zu den Jahren 80—90 herabzugehen.“ (II, 560.) Der amerikanische Theolog Hayes (*John and His Writings*, 1917) entscheidet sich nach einer sehr ausführlichen Besprechung aller einschlägigen Fragen für das Ende des ersten Jahrhunderts, indem er unter anderem sagt: “If the Church Fathers are right in saying that John the Apostle lived to old age in Ephesus, and if the best authorities are agreed that the fourth gospel must have come into existence some time near the close of the first century there in Ephesus, how shall we escape the conclusion that the gospel was written by the Apostle John himself? . . . It probably was more than sixty years since he had left his fisher's nets to follow the Lord. . . . He had preached the Gospel-truth to two generations. Now he would write it down for all the generations to come.” (S. 136. 155.) Und als letzten Zeugen dieser Gruppe nennen wir Lenski (*Interpretation of John's Gospel*, 1931), der seine Schlußfolgerungen kurz niederlegt in den Sätzen: “Here [nämlich in Ephesus] the Apostle John wrote his gospel in his old age, at the solicitation of the Asiatic elders. The date of writing lies between the years 75 and 100, probably somewhere near 80 or 85.” (S. 20.)

Zu diesen Zeugnissen gesellt sich aber noch eins, das neuesten Datums ist und das mit Recht vielerorts die Aufmerksamkeit der Neutestamentler auf sich gezogen hat. Es ist dies eine Monographie in der Serie „Neutestamentliche Forschungen“, herausgegeben von Otto Schmiz, die den Titel führt „Das Johannesevangelium als Alterswerk“, eine psychologische Untersuchung von Lic. Gerhard Hoffmann (1933). Das Buch bietet zunächst eine psychologische Analyse des Greisenalters, sodann eine psychologische Analyse des Johannesevangeliums und schließlich eine Komparation, in der der Verfasser seine Folgerungen kurz zusammenstellt. Man mag dem Verfasser nicht in allen Punkten beistimmen wollen, wenn er so ausführlich von intellektuellen Fähigkeiten, vom Gefühlsleben und von Willenseigentümlichkeiten redet, trotz dem wir durchaus die menschliche Seite der Bibel, das heißt, die in den verschiedenen Büchern zutage tretenden Eigentümlichkeiten der einzelnen Schreiber nicht verkennen wollen. Aber wenn wir hier den Nachweis finden, daß z. B. das Hervortreten von Lieblingswörtern und -gedanken nach der Art alter Leute zu einem formelhaften Gebrauch mancher Wörter sowie zur Verkleinerung des Sprachschates führt, wenn wir auf gewisse Besonderheiten des Stils achten, wie sie sich im Alter ausprägen, so können wir nicht umhin, diesen Tatsachen etwas Beachtung zu

schenken. Hoffmann sagt in seiner Komparation unter andern: „Die Phantasie ist unanschaulich. Das Denken ist langsam. Wohl aber ist es in höchstem Maße geisterfüllt. Die Phantasie ist produktiv. Das Denken ist original. Und eben dies haben wir als Merkmale des Alterschaffens kennengelernt. . . . Endlich aber läßt sich noch auf viele Einzelheiten hinweisen, in denen die Psyche des Evangelisten der Alterspsyche entspricht, bis hin in stilistische Kleinigkeiten.“ (S. 173.) Der Verfasser schließt mit der Bemerkung: „Fragen wir endlich noch, was nun mit unserm Ergebnis gewonnen ist, so dürfte als wichtigster Gewinn dies zu buchen sein, daß das hohe Alter des Evangelisten die psychologische Möglichkeit des Evangeliums sicherstellt. Weil der Verfasser die Absonderlichkeiten, aber auch die Reife und Tiefe des alt gewordenen Menschen besaß, darum ist sein Werk bei allen äußerlichen Mängeln [?] das tiefstinnigste Buch der Weltliteratur geworden, in welchem ‚jedes Wort einen Zentner wiegt‘.“ (S. 183.)

Hierzu kommen aber noch gewisse innere Gründe, die auf eine späte Verabfassung des vierten Evangeliums hinweisen. Schon die vielfache Beschreibung jüdischer Sitten und Gebräuche weist nicht nur auf eine räumliche, sondern auch auf eine zeitliche Entfernung hin, z. B. Kap. 2, 6; 8, 37 ff. Von besonderer Bedeutung ist die Benennung des galiläischen Meeres als Meer τῆς Γαλιλαίας τῆς Τιβεριάδος, Kap. 6, 1. Bis zur Zeit der Zerstörung Jerusalems war diese Stadt den Juden eine heidnische Stadt, und sie wird darum in den Synoptikern überhaupt nicht genannt. Gegen Ende des Jahrhunderts aber war Tiberias eine jüdische Stadt, und der See erhielt von ihr seinen Namen. Auch andere geographische Bezeichnungen lassen sich am besten erklären, wenn man die Verabfassung des Buches gegen das Ende des ersten Jahrhunderts ansetzt. Dieser Tatsache widerspricht nicht Kap. 5, 2, mit der Bezugnahme auf den Teich Bethesda, wie lange meint (Das apostolische Zeitalter, II, 420 f.); denn dieser Teich wurde bei der Eroberung der Stadt nicht verschüttet, sondern war gegen Ende des Jahrhunderts noch dort zu sehen. Wir bleiben also getrost bei der festen Meinung, daß das Johannesevangelium von dem Apostel Johannes gegen Ende des Jahrhunderts geschrieben wurde, und zwar in Ephesus.

P. E. KREHMANN

The Amazing Mass of Biblical Manuscripts

This year of our Lord, 1937, bids fair to become the beginning of a third great period in the history of the Greek text of our Bible. Later generations of Bible-lovers will no doubt refer to this period of textual criticism as that of decipherment, transcription, and conservative comparison. True, this latter textual activity has been in progress for the last generation, but it becomes ap-

parent with the wealth of material now on hand that only a modest beginning has been made. The century just ended, from 1836 to 1936, has resolved itself into an age of such amazing discoveries of manuscripts that it deserves special mention and study in the annals of the Greek text.

During the first period of text history the collection of material overshadowed all other considerations. This period can well be said to have begun in 1627, when Codex Alexandrinus came to England. This first period ended in 1836, when Prof. J. M. A. Scholz summed up all that had been done hitherto in the way of listing manuscripts by publishing a catalog of New Testament manuscripts. This catalog was six years in the making, and it listed the then already amazing total of 1,280 Biblical manuscripts, which it had taken 200 years to gather and classify.

The important Codex Alexandrinus was a gift from Cyril Lucar, patriarch of Constantinople, who offered it to James I through his ambassador at the Golden Porte; but it did not reach England until Charles I was on the throne. Cyril had been patriarch of Alexandria and brought the manuscript with him when he was transferred to Constantinople in 1621. The book dates from the first half of the fifth century. Bound in four volumes, now bearing the royal arms and initials of Charles I, it can be seen in the British Museum, a gift to that great institution by George II in 1757. The beautiful book is written on fine vellum pages about $10\frac{1}{2}$ by $12\frac{1}{2}$ inches in size, with two columns to the page. It contains the entire Greek Bible, except for accidental mutilations. These, unfortunately, amount to the loss of nearly all of Matthew, parts of the Psalms, John, and Second Corinthians. In all 773 leaves remain out of an original total of 820. The manuscript contains also some Old and New Testament apocrypha, *viz.*, Third and Fourth Maccabees, Psalms of Solomon, and First and Second Clement.

When this ancient manuscript arrived in England, it instantly created a sensation among Biblical scholars and ushered in the first great period in the history of textual criticism. Bishop Bryan Walton included its principal readings in his polyglot Bible of 1657. Next, this discovery and its subsequent publication started a veritable world-wide search for manuscripts, especially of the New Testament, and it powerfully stimulated the tabulation of variations of readings found in these newly discovered manuscripts. An immediate search of the great libraries of Europe resulted in a series of publications over the next two centuries, in which English and German scholars took the leading part. The tabulating and numbering of the manuscripts for easy reference dates from this time. Uncial manuscripts were indicated by the capital

letters of the Latin and Greek alphabets, and minuscule manuscripts by Arabic numbers.¹⁾

As a further tangible result of this sudden interest in the Greek text the various polyglot Bibles made their appearance in the seventeenth century. The huge Paris Polyglot (1629—1645) came out in ten volumes and five languages: Hebrew, Latin, Greek, Syriac, and Arabic, with an addition of the Samaritan Pentateuch. Last of the great polyglots was the aforementioned London Polyglot in eight volumes, edited by Bishop Walton. It reached a total of seven languages, viz., Hebrew (Old Testament), Greek, Latin, Syriac, Ethiopian, Arabic, and Persian (New Testament only), with Latin translations for all, and compared with the Samaritan Pentateuch, various targumim, and paraphrasings.

England remained in the lead in this work during the remainder of the seventeenth century and the early part of the eighteenth. More and more manuscripts were being ferreted from their late, obscure resting-places in the museumlike libraries. By 1675, the dean of Christ Church, Dr. John Fell, had produced a critical apparatus in which he used over one hundred manuscripts. He used the Coptic and Gothic versions, together with the *textus receptus* of Robert Henri Estienne (Stephanus), Walton, and others. He based most of his comparative work on numerous manuscripts found in the Bodleian library at Oxford.

The peak of this work in England of that period was reached by John Mill. He was most unselfishly encouraged and pecuniarily assisted by Dr. Fell. For more than twenty-five years Mill assiduously collected manuscripts, to publish in 1707 a New Testament edition with textual annotations to the *textus receptus* from seventy-eight other manuscripts besides those employed by Stephanus. Mill compared all translations accessible to him, and he was the first one to adduce Scripture-passages quoted by the early Christian Fathers. The in itself elaborate introduction to his *opus magnum* is considered to have laid the foundation for textual criticism of the New Testament. For many decades to come his work remained the basis for scholarly, comparative, and, as far as England was concerned, withal reverent critical work on the New Testament text.

Nine years before his decapitation on Tower Hill (1645) Archbishop William Laud of Canterbury, an able student of the

1) Uncials: inch-size letters written separately, with the words running together in a solid stream. Minuscules: cursives, with the letters connected as in our modern handwriting; they are smaller than the uncials. The tenth century is usually taken as a broad division between these two styles of Greek writing, although there are minuscules of the ninth and uncials of the eleventh century.

ancient manuscripts, presented a codex of the seventh century to the Bodleian library in 1636. This is now known as the Codex Laudianus (E₂). The text was the same as that used by the Venerable Bede (born 673) in his Anglo-Saxon translation of the fourth gospel. Hearne finally published it in 1715, but few scholars were acquainted with this earlier manuscript.

It was a hostile English atmosphere which feared that the publication of so many variant readings would engender doubt as to the inspiration and integrity of the Scriptures (although it is evident that no point of Christian truth is at all affected by the variants) that catapulted the leadership in this particular field of Bible-study into the laps of German scholars.

In Germany, where respect and reverence for the divine inspiration of the Holy Scriptures was less pronounced than among their Anglo-Saxon cousins across the North Sea, if not often entirely absent, a tremendous critical activity developed. As is sadly recognized by believing scholars, the German school did not often remain in the conservative realms of lower criticism, but manifested serious aberrations going into the sphere of higher criticism of the destructive and negative type. Much modern writing of a shallow kind is still infected with its blight. For the ensuing century little more was heard of English contributions to the subject.²⁾

The scene now shifts to the Continent, where J. J. Wettstein was the first to compile a list of manuscripts with the nomenclature that is universally followed to this day. In 1752 he listed 21 uncials, and above 250 minuscules.³⁾

2) It must not be forgotten, however, that the Codex Bezae, fifth century, and presented to Cambridge by Theodore Beza in 1581, had been slightly used by Stephanus and Beza. It was more fully drawn on by Walton and published in its entirety by Cambridge University in 1793. Its divergence from the *textus receptus* caused it to be regarded with some suspicion, and British scholars refused to attach much importance to it.

3) A first actual attempt at classification was made by J. A. Bengel, who in 1734 classified the number of authorities on hand. He concerned himself with the quality of the manuscripts rather than their quantity alone. He distinguished between the then most ancient, which he called African and Asian MSS., and the later MSS., which are considered as containing the Byzantine, or received text. This somewhat limited division was expanded by J. S. Semler in 1767. He devised a threefold classification, *viz.*, I. *Alexandrian*: the then earliest Greek MSS. and the Syriac, Coptic, and Ethiopian MSS. II. *Eastern*: sources in Constantinople and Antioch, including the chief mass of manuscripts then available. III. *Western*: as contained in the Latin versions and the Fathers, with the exception of Origen. Semler's theory in turn was extended by his pupil J. J. Griesbach, who between 1774 and 1805 applied Semler's system of grouping to Wettstein's list and made a precise allotment of the several MSS., versions, and Fathers to the several groups proposed by his teacher; *e.g.*, he placed the quotations of Origen, Clement of Alexandria, and Eusebius into the first, or Alexandrian group, whereas he placed the Codex Alexandrinus into the Eastern group.

The constantly swelling number of manuscripts was augmented further by C. F. Matthaei, who added 57 manuscripts in the six-year period from 1782—1788. Later, from 1803—1807, this same scholar added a few more. Further additions to the list of known manuscripts were made from the Imperial Library at Vienna and from various museums and libraries in Spain, Italy, and Germany. These collections brought the work to the end of the eighteenth century, enabling the above-mentioned Professor Scholz to bring out by 1836 his celebrated catalog of New Testament manuscripts, which already listed the imposing and amazing array for that day of

Uncials of the Gospels	26
Uncials of the Acts and General Epistles ..	8
Uncials of the Pauline Epistles	9
Uncials of the Apocalypse	3
<i>Total</i>	46 uncials;
Minuscules of the Gospels	469
Minuscules of the Acts and General Epistles	192
Minuscules of the Pauline Epistles	246
Minuscules of the Apocalypse	88
<i>Total</i>	995 minuscules.

To this were added 239 lectionaries, collections of pericopes, which brought the total of catalogued manuscripts to 1,280 by the beginning of 1837 A. D., and that year may aptly be said to mark the beginning of the second period in the history of the Greek text.

This amazing grand total of 1,280 manuscripts collected and collated from 1627 to 1836 cannot strictly be attributed to discovery. It represents mainly the result of careful cataloging on a grand scale of existing treasures long unnoticed in the art and book collections of Europe. It remained for the second period from 1837 to 1936 to become one of most astonishing discovery, textual study and publication of studied findings.

This great century opens with new and young blood. In 1840, immediately after taking his theological degree in Leipzig, a young man breaks into the scene who at once carried the search for manuscripts into the world's more isolated places. He examined the bindings of books,⁴⁾ gathered divers sheets of old vellum, and searched libraries in remote, forgotten, and hazardous countries. This was Constantine Tischendorf (1815—1874), who was responsible for a greater number of additions to the list of known manuscripts than any other scholar before or since, and whose career

4) It has always been a fascinating pastime for this writer to peek behind the backs of the bindings in his own library, often to find scraps of old newspapers of two or three or even more generations ago.

was crowned by the most sensational discovery in the history of Biblical scholarship. The discovery of the Codex Sinaiticus and his edition of the Codex Vaticanus,⁵⁾ were the supreme achievements of his eventful life. The story of Tischendorf's finding of the Sinaiticus is so full of fascinating detail that it should receive a special treatise, for the few lines that could at best be given to it in this brief chronological review would not do it justice. It is hoped that the full story of the Codex Sinaiticus can be given in a subsequent article, inasmuch as this famous manuscript lately has been much before the public because of its recent acquisition by the British Museum from the Russian Communist government for good capitalist gold.

The whole list of Tischendorf's discoveries is otherwise amazing enough. For the first, he discovered eighteen uncial manuscripts and six minuscules. He became the first editor of twenty-five uncials and reedited eleven others of the first importance; he transcribed four more and collated thirteen. Excepting the Codex Alexandrinus and the Codex Bezae, there was no manuscript of real value to the knowledge of which Tischendorf did not contribute to a greater or lesser degree. The textual studies of this young scholar were of the most tireless nature. He published eight editions of the Greek New Testament, far surpassing, naturally, the Greek New Testament of Erasmus;⁶⁾ four editions of the

5) The Codex Vaticanus, fourth century, had been in the Vatican Library since 1481 as far as we know, and although used by Sixtus V for his edition of the Septuagint, it had found scant notice with reference to the New Testament. Not until after it had been taken to Paris by Napoleon subsequently to his loot of Italy and the Vatican, did a German scholar, Hug, realize and proclaim its age and value. When, after the fall of Napoleon, it was returned to Rome, the Vatican authorities withheld it from foreign scholars. Their explanation was that the Vatican intended to publish it at some later date. This promised publication was not made until 1857, and then it was so badly done that it was unserviceable for any purpose except for the revelation of an astonishing lack of interest in early Bible manuscripts on the part of the Vatican.

6) "If Erasmus had known that he was working for the ages, instead of getting ahead of Ximenes, he might have taken more pains to edit his Greek N. T." (Prof. A. T. Robertson, *Studies in the Text of the New Testament*, p. 36.) Erasmus, it will be remembered, produced a very hurried work in order to anticipate the work of the Complutensian archbishop. As early as 1502 Cardinal Francisco Ximenes de Cisneros, Archbishop of Toledo and Prime Minister of Spain, began the preparation of an edition of the Greek Bible at the University of Alcalá. Since he endeavored to accompany the Greek text by the Hebrew and Latin the work progressed but slowly. Although the N. T. was ready in 1514 it was held back from publication until the O. T. should be completed. Ximenes died in 1517, and when this great Inquisitor died, the Reformation was born. Stunica carried on the work, and in 1522 the Complutensian Polyglot (from Latin "Complutum" for Alcalá) was given to the printers. Erasmus' wily and enterprising bookseller and publisher, Frobenius of Basel, heard of the work contemplated in Spain and com-

Latin; and four of the Septuagint. His final edition of the New Testament in Greek, completed two years before his untimely death (1874), has remained one of the standard editions for the use of scholars. It is only now, at this late date, that a new edition is being prepared in England along the same lines,⁷⁾ incorporating, however, into it the results of all those recent discoveries which Constantine von Tischendorf did not live to see.

Using the abundant textual material with which Tischendorf had provided them, the two celebrated Cambridge scholars Westcott and Hort undertook the preparation of the revised Greek New Testament. Together with the parallel task of an English revision pursuant to appointment by the Canterbury Convocation, the Greek text of Westcott and Hort was given to the world in May, 1881.⁸⁾ In this text the student at last had an admirably accurate Greek text, based on the then known most ancient authorities.

But meanwhile, on the Continent, the Wuerttemberg Bible Society had brought out as early as 1853 a Greek New Testament with the embodiment of Tischendorf's discoveries. The Basel Bible Society followed in 1880. However, the epoch-making event came when by request of the Wuerttemberg Bible Society Dr. Eberhard Nestle of Ulm published the first edition of his *Novum Testamentum Graece cum Apparatu Critico*, in 1898. He made the fullest and undoubtedly the ablest use of Westcott and Hort and all that had thus far been done in New Testament study from the textual point of view. Nestle's edition of the New Testament came out in a new edition at an average of every two years. The work was as ably continued after his death, March 9, 1913, by his son,

missioned the equally wily and enterprising Erasmus to anticipate it. He urged him to proceed with the greatest of speed, a bit of advice that must of necessity be detrimental to so important a work. Desiderius Erasmus, lacking the thoroughness that characterized Luther, went to work at once, using only such few manuscripts as happened to be obtainable at Basel (two of these were lent him by Dean Colet from the library of St. Paul's Cathedral in London). These were five late minuscules, the best one of the 11th century, and very little used by him. He had two 15th-century MSS. for the gospels, one 13th- or 14th-century MS. for Acts and the epistles, and a 12th-century MS. for Revelation. He was ready to print September 11, 1515, and finished the work on March 1, 1516, thus "winning" the race by six years at the cost of accuracy and thoroughness, a fault felt through four successive centuries. In fairness to Erasmus, it should be mentioned, however, that in his sixth and last edition of 1527 he made some use of the Complutensian, but the general inadequacy of the work remained largely unaffected.

7) Sir Frederic Kenyon, *The Story of the Bible*, 1936, p. 73. The first instalment (Mark) was published in April, 1935.

8) *The New Testament in the Original Greek*. The text revised by Brooke Foss Westcott, D.D., and Fenton John Anthony Hort, D.D., London and Cambridge.

Dr. Erwin Nestle. The sixteenth edition appeared early in 1936.⁹⁾ It is generally considered the purest Greek text in existence today.

Thus, in 1881, it did indeed look as if the period of New Testament research had come to a successful and triumphant close. Scholars had a new Greek Bible based on the earliest authorities, and English readers had a revised English Bible based upon this

9) This sixteenth edition is such a marvelous piece of work, so filled with fascinating textual readings for the lover of the Greek Testament that one easily could devote the space of an entire article to an enthusiastic description of it. In passing, a few of the new features of this edition can be mentioned; e.g., *χριστός* has been spelled with a small *χ* where it designates the office of the Messiah (Matt. 16, 16), and it is written with a capital letter where it has become a proper noun, as in Gal. 3, 24—29. This of course leaves room for some differences of opinion. Former users of Nestle's text will find a number of new designs inserted at various places. These have become necessary on account of the great number of new manuscripts compared in the critical apparatus. Here for the first time an editor of the New Testament dares to indicate readings that in all probability can be considered original in the strictest sense of the term. The additional new readings are the result of a comparison of the more recently discovered manuscript, such as the Washington Codex (W), the Koridethi Gospels (Θ), and numerous papyri, in particular the Chester Beatty Papyri (pp. 45 to 47), and the Michigan parts of the same (46) and Michigan 1570, 1571 (pp. 37, 38). Another significant feature employed by Dr. Erwin Nestle in this edition is his system of grouping of manuscripts. He groups variants into an *§* group, i. e., the Hesychian, or Egyptian, family of texts, consisting in the main of Codex Vaticanus (B), the Sinaiticus (Σ), and the Codex Ephraemi rescriptus (C), and, with lesser consideration, the Paris Gospels of the eighth century (L), the St. Gallen Gospels of the ninth century (Δ), an Athos MS. of the eighth century (Ψ), and a few minuscules. As an instance of the wealth of material consulted and compared, Nestle publishes by name a list of 76 manuscripts; of these, 65 are valuable uncials, and 11 of the more important minuscules are mentioned by catalog number; "most" minuscules have been consulted, however. This manuscript list appended is particularly serviceable in that it gives not only the usual classifications of manuscripts, but also their age, specific name, exact contents, and present repository. Not satisfied with comparing this sizable number of available text manuscripts, the editor has compared many ancient translations; e.g., he refers to 40 Latin, 6 Syriac, and 7 assorted rare versions, as the Sahidic, Bohairic, Ethiopian, Arabic, Armenian, Georgian, and Gothic. In further addition to all this comparative material he compares Biblical quotations as found in 36 of the old Fathers and in 5 New Testament apocrypha. Parallel passages enumerated and referred to in the outer margin are more numerous and complete than in any other existing edition. This welcome feature often turns the handy volume into a small concordance. The unusual wealth of parallels published in a small margin is made possible by Nestle's very efficient system of abbreviations for the books of the Bible: Gn, Ex, Lv, Nu, Dt, Jos, Jdc, Rth, 1. 2 Sm, 1. 2 Rg, 1. 2 Chr, Esr, Neh, Esth; Job, Ps, Prv, Eccl, Ct; Is, Jr, Ez, Dn, Hos, Joel, Am, Ob, Jon, Mch, Nah, Hab, Zph, Hgg, Zch, Ml; (Jdth, Sap, Tob, Sir, Bar, 1—4 Mcc); Mt, Mc, L, J; Act; R, 1. 2 K, G, E, Ph, Kol, 1. 2 Th, 1. 2 T, Tt, Phm;

earlier Greek text.¹⁰ It seemed as though nothing more needed to be done than to ponder and digest these results. No further change was expected for some time to come.

Yet, another age of discoveries was just opening. A most momentous march of Greek manuscripts, mainly from the desert sands of Egypt, began to fill the museums of Europe and America, ever widening our knowledge of the Bible text and its early history, thereby testing the results accumulated until 1881.

From the very spot of Tischendorf's discovery of the Sinaiticus, the monastery of St. Catherine at the foot of the alleged Mount Sinai, came a new find in 1889. Dr. Rendel Harris stumbled upon a lost early Christian work in a Syriac translation, *The Apology of Aristides*, a defense of the Christian religion before Antoninus Pius by the Athenian philosopher, about 140 A.D.¹¹ This discovery helped to dispel the discrediting claims of the German school that none of our gospels were written before 140 A.D. and that they were, therefore, of little historical authority. These critical contentions were entirely confounded when the discovery of an Arabian translation of the *Diatessaron* in 1888 established without a doubt the authenticity of Tatian's work as a harmony of the gospels. This was conclusive proof that by at least 170 A.D. the

H; Jc, 1.2 P, 1-3 J, Jd; Ap. The inner margin carries a list of the ancient textual divisions before the era of our present chapters and verses. There is first the old Greek paragraph division (κεφάλαια), the famous division of the Cod. Vat. (B), with which agrees perfectly Cod. Ξ (Zacynthius, eighth century), and, above all, the sections and "canons" of Eusebius as explained fully in his letter to Carpian (this letter Εὐσέβιος Καριανῷ ἀγαπῶν ἀδελφῷ ἐν κυρίῳ is again included in the prefatory material). Finally, the introduction is given in German, English, Latin, and Norwegian, and the nicest turn of all is that each is prefaced by J. A. Bengel's apt motto "*Te totum applica ad textum; rem totam applica ad te.*"

10) Unfortunately the revisers disobeyed instructions "to introduce as few alterations as possible into the text of the Authorized Version consistent with faithfulness." A somewhat pedantic scholarship could not resist making such changes as sadly marred the instinctive sense of style which was the heritage of the King James translators. This repelled the general reader, and the inevitable result has been fatal to the general acceptance of this revised version. Sir Frederic Kenyon, who, together with Prof. U. Wilcken, is the greatest living papyrologist, opines in his recent *The Story of the Bible* (first printing, January, 1936), to which this article is greatly indebted, as follows: "Time has rather increased than diminished the weight of criticism of the literary shortcomings of the English," and he advises keeping an eye on the Revised Version although it "can never be the magnificent monument of English which the Authorized Version is, and can never bring home to us the sacred story with the same unequalled appeal of majestic language."

11) The *Apology* actually never had been lost; but the original Greek had been cleverly embedded in a Christian novel of about the seventh century. This Syriac version helped to identify it.

four canonical gospels held undisputed sway and primacy over all other narratives of our Lord's life.¹²⁾

That flood of papyri from Egypt, in particular from the Fayum District and Oxyrhynchus, dug up from the *koms*, or rubbish heaps, of the Lake Moeris region by Drs. Grenfell, Hunt, and Hogarth, and published in convenient and continuous series by the Egypt Exploration Society,¹³⁾ continued unabated and reached overwhelming proportions in 1894. Although papyri of strictly Biblical content were not very numerous, the Greco-Roman *débris* in Egypt gave up a considerable part of the Epistle to the Hebrews, written on the back of an epitome of Livy.¹⁴⁾ The others were small fragments, but of some collective value. P. L. Hedley enumerates 174 of the Old Testament, and 157 of the New Testament, in an unpublished catalog of Biblical papyri.

Another decade, and, quite unintentionally, the Freer Gallery in Washington, D. C., had the fortune of becoming a depository for the earliest copies of the gospels in Greek that have come down to us. Mr. Chas. L. Freer of Detroit, a collector of oriental paintings, while traveling in Egypt in 1906, found a group of vellum manuscripts in the establishment of Ali Arabi, a dealer in antiques, near Cairo. Mr. Freer noticed their obviously early character and Biblical contents. Although he was not interested in this particular collectors' field, he nevertheless made the purchase, realizing the opportunity of acquiring some documents of antiquity for the United States. Both the Egyptian Museum in Berlin and the

12) As far back as 1836 Venetian monks had printed an Armenian version of St. Ephrem's commentary (fourth century) of the *Diatessaron* as a concordance of the four canonical gospels. Armenian being practically unknown to Western scholars, no one took notice of it. Even a Latin translation of this same work by the same monks, in 1876, remained unnoticed until 1880, when Dr. Ezra Abbot called attention to it. This led to further research and became productive of the publication of the Arabian *Diatessaron*, in 1888.—Mention should be made at this point of a most interesting discovery made public during the last months of 1935, viz., that of the Dura Fragment. Dura is the remains of a Roman fort on the banks of the Euphrates, discovered by British officers in 1920. When the site became a mandated area of France, French-American archeologists carefully investigated it. Among the ruins of a Christian church a number of papyri and vellum manuscripts were found. They were examined at Yale in 1933 and brought to light a fragment of the *Diatessaron* in Greek. It contains only the incident of Joseph of Arimathea's petition for the body of our Lord. The Persians destroyed Dura in 256 A. D., so the manuscripts must have been written before that date.

13) The Egypt Exploration Society (then the Fund) in 1897 started the so-called "Greco-Roman Branch, for the discovery and publication of remains of classical antiquity and early Christianity in Egypt" and began publishing its *Greco-Roman Memoirs*, containing and collating the papyri. Vol. 23 is to be published in 1937.

14) Originally published as Oxyrhynchus Papyri No. 657, now in British Museum collection No. 1532.

British Museum had rejected an offer to acquire the manuscripts. The collection contained two manuscripts of each, the Old and the New Testament. The manuscript of the four gospels, known as Codex Washington (W), now is world-famous. This codex also contains the disputed last twelve verses of Mark's gospel.¹⁵⁾

Until 1929 many minor discoveries were made which certainly deserve mention in this necessarily incomplete and somewhat hurried enumeration. Four handsome vellum manuscripts of the sixth century came to light during this time, emerging from such out-of-the-way places as Rossano, in Southern Italy; Albania; Cappadocia; and Sinope, on the Black Sea. Two of these scripts contained illustrations and no doubt were de-luxe volumes in their day. The number of existing known manuscripts of the Bible by this time was fast approaching the 5,000 mark, and the end was not yet!

It was in 1930 when a discovery was made that put all the others in the shade, a discovery rivaled only by that earlier one of the Codex Sinaiticus, which is in process of publication now as these lines are being written. This is the group of papyri now referred to as the Chester Beatty Biblical papyri.¹⁶⁾ The University

15) Facsimiles of W are published by the University of Michigan (Prof. H. A. Sanders) through the Freer Foundation. Through the good offices and interested efforts of our own Dr. L. Fuerbringer the library of Concordia Seminary in St. Louis received a number of copies of these valuable facsimiles of the Codex Washington. The Seminary library owns facsimiles of Genesis, Deuteronomy, Joshua, the Minor Prophets, and the four gospels. It might be added here that our library also possesses a facsimile copy of the Codex Sinaiticus.

16) The details attending this remarkable discovery as yet have not been fully revealed. The papyri are said to have been found in a Coptic cemetery of the ancient city of Aphroditopolis, on the opposite side of the river from the Fayum. Mr. A. Chester Beatty is a well-known American collector in England and owner of a most magnificent collection of illuminated Western and Oriental manuscripts.—The latest news, as reported in the *London Morning Post* during March, 1936, is that Mr. Beatty has again bought from an Egyptian dealer a quantity of leaves of a manuscript containing such parts of the Pauline epistles as were missing in Mr. Beatty's earlier collections. Sir Frederic Kenyon is preparing the whole of the manuscript for publication. It comprises about five-sixths of the text of Paul's epistles. Timothy, Titus, and Philemon are missing still. Of more than passing interest is the fact that the Epistle to the Hebrews is placed second in this collection, following immediately after Romans. This is a distinct "innovation," since no other manuscript thus places the epistles. Sir Frederic places these manuscripts into the early part of the third century. That would make them about a hundred years older than the Codex Sinaiticus, and it thus becomes the oldest manuscript of any considerable size of the New Testament. It is written in the ordinary ink of the time, in a good and clear hand, easy to decipher. A few variations in detail exist, as in all manuscripts, but our existing text is again confirmed. The papyri are in a generally good condition; only a few lines on the bottom of each page are blurred through friction or wear.

of Michigan happily acquired some of the leaves and fragments. The physical aspect and extent of this discovery was first described by Sir Frederic Kenyon in an article in the *London Times* of November 17, 1931. At that time he could enumerate twelve manuscripts, eight of portions of the Old Testament and three of the New. One contained some chapters of the apocryphal Book of Enoch and an unnamed Christian homily.

The New Testament leaves are of prime importance. One group originally was a copy of all four gospels and the Acts. They are written in a small hand, with a script peculiar to the mode of writing in the first half of the third century, which makes them a century older than both the Vaticanus and the Sinaiticus. The other group contains the major part of the Pauline epistles, written in a fine hand, which Professor Wilcken would place at about 200 A. D. When the entire collection is published, the University of Michigan cooperating with Sir Frederic, scholars will have the epistles of St. Paul in a copy written only about 150 years after his death.

Indeed, discoveries of manuscripts of the Greek Scriptures have been crowding fast upon each other these last few years, confirming the Church's age-long faith and putting to rout the speculations and theories of its enemies. Today it can only be either ignorance or outspoken hostility to the Word of God to cast aspersions and doubts upon the integrity and authenticity of the sacred text. A United Press dispatch dated London, November 18, 1935, announced: "Oldest text of Bible believed discovered." Here reference was had to one of the Biblical papyri in the John Rylands Library at Manchester, England. It consists of part of St. John's gospel and has been assigned to the early second century by Dr. Henry Guppy, the Rylands librarian.¹⁷⁾

17) Not quite a year later, viz., in August, 1936, the traceable history of the transmission of the text was pushed still farther back into recorded history. This time, however, we have a text of the LXX. The manuscript was published without delay by the Manchester University Press (*Two Biblical Papyri in the John Rylands Library*. Edited by C. H. Roberts, M. A. With facsimile.) The four fragments composing this manuscript contain Deut. 23, 24 to 24, 3 in the LXX version. They were purchased by Dr. Rendel Harris and are of special interest as they were written in the second century B. C. Hitherto no manuscript of any part of the Bible has been found written earlier than the second century A. D., so that these fragments are some 300 years older than any other manuscript of the Bible in any language and bring us within a century of the time when the Ptolemean translators were at work in Egypt. These papyri constitute the only pre-Christian evidence for the text of the Old Testament. When discovered, the documents formed part of a cartonnage, i. e., papyrus torn up and glued together and then coated with plaster to be used for mummy-wrappings. They had to be put in boiling water before the leaves could be separated. This, incidentally, is a splendid testimonial to the fastness of Egyptian

Thus, whereas in 1836 the list of known Biblical manuscripts stood at the respectable figure of 1,280, this wealth of Scriptural documents had increased to just a few short of 5,000 a hundred years later, and no one knows what the future will bring. We have now several witnesses from the third century and one even from as early as the beginning of the second. This is undeniably striking outward proof of the soundness of canonical tradition, that with these thousands of copies from so many different parts of the ancient and medieval world the variant readings of the text involve simply questions of linguistic detail and not any disagreement as to essential contents or articles of faith. So, whether we have a translation from an early or from a late manuscript, we have in our hand the true and inspired Word of God.

Another point of external evidence worth mentioning is the fact that we have far more and far older manuscripts of our Bible than of any other ancient book, and this despite the fact that early Christianity was vehemently persecuted and its sacred books were the special object of search and destruction, a fate not shared by those pagan writers whose works constitute part of our classical education. The "best" preserved author in this class is Vergil; yet the earliest manuscript we now possess of him was written 350 years after his death. For all the other classic writers the distance between the author and his earliest extant works is much greater. For Livy the interval is about 500 years; for Horace it is 900, for most of Plato 1,300, and for Euripides 1,600 years. Our earliest extant New Testament manuscripts on the contrary were written only from 100 to 150 years after the death of their inspired authors. Again, while at most only a few score of manuscript fragments of the pagan writers are in existence today, the total number of our Biblical manuscripts runs, as before stated, very close to 5,000, so close in fact that by the time this reaches print, scholars may have 5,000 manuscripts of God's Word at their disposal. A most amazing century this, from 1836 to 1936!

C. C. C. Headquarters, Van Nuys, Cal.

R. T. DU BRAU

ink, a secret our modern ink-makers would gladly give a fortune for. The cartonnage probably came from the Fayum, where Jewish communities existed at that time, to whom the Deuteronomy text might have belonged. — Also in 1935, in January, the British Museum announced the acquisition of additional fragments of Greek papyri from Egypt. They were described in the *London Times* of January 23, 1935, by Mr. Harold Idris Bell, keeper of the manuscripts in the British Museum. In March the trustees published them under the title *Fragments of an Unknown Gospel and Other Early Christian Papyri*. Edited by H. Idris Bell and T. C. Skeat. 63 pp., with 5 plates. So great is the general interest in Great Britain in these papyrus discoveries that the Oxford University Press had to order a second impression of the work in the third month after publication. The manuscript raises such interesting questions that it deserves a special discussion rather than this brief mention in a footnote.

Study on Rom. 8, 33—39

Eisenach Epistle for Eleventh Sunday after Trinity

With remarkable unanimity Romans 8 has ever been regarded as one of the sublimest flights of oratory, rarely, if ever, equaled by anything that the human mind has conceived or the pen of man has written. The grandeur of the language is more than matched by the exalted nature of the contents of this unique chapter. In the first part of this chapter, vv. 1—17, "the apostle reminds the Christians that the Spirit of God dwells in them and that therefore they are under obligation to live according to the Spirit, who pledges to them their sonship and heavenly heritage; and he solemnly warns them against living after the flesh lest they die and perish." (Stoeckhardt, *Roemerbrief*, p. 371.) In the closing verse of this first part the apostle had spoken of the necessity of suffering with Christ, v. 17. The second part of the chapter shows why every believer ought to be willing to suffer with Christ. The future glory far outweighs the present suffering, vv. 18—25; God's own Spirit supports us in all tribulations, vv. 26, 27; all things must work together for good to us, v. 28; God has predestinated us to eternal life, vv. 29, 30; nothing can rob us of our salvation, vv. 31—39. This last argument is developed in a series of seven questions, which finally change into a triumphant assertion of unwavering, unconquerable assurance of obtaining the final victory over all enemies of our salvation, of being forever united with God and His love which is in Christ Jesus.

Of the seven questions, the first is one of worshipful amazement, "What shall we, then, say to these things?" The remaining six questions form a remarkable climax of ever-increasing joyous triumph, culminating in the bold statements of vv. 37—39. The first two of these six questions, found in v. 31, immediately preceding our lesson, really comprise the sum and substance of the entire passage. The four remaining questions merely unfold the details, serving to increase the assurance of our salvation.

If that God who spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, if that God be for us, who shall, who can, be against us? How is it possible, conceivable, that He shall not with His own Son also freely give us all things? If He has given us His Son, with whom He is one in essence, He has actually given Himself to us. And if we have God in and with His Son, what can there be lacking for our salvation in time and eternity? Ps. 73, 25, 26. This is the theme expanded in the lesson for the Eleventh Sunday after Trinity.

It may not be out of place to note that the apostle is writing to believing children of God, the called saints, Rom. 1, 7, 8. He is

not preaching a missionary sermon; he is not endeavoring to persuade them to become Christians; he is not seeking to convert them. That change has been wrought in them. His purpose is to *strengthen* their faith, to impart to them some spiritual gift to the end that they may be *established*, 1, 11. His desire is to remove all doubt and fear as to their salvation, to fill their hearts with heavenly confidence, so that they will be disturbed neither by vexing doubts as to their election nor by anxious worries as to their future glorification.

"Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth," v. 33. Who are these elect, chosen, gathered out? We need not be uncertain as to their identity. The apostle had spoken of "them that love God," "them who are the called," the believers; for they alone love God, they alone are the called. These believers were not called in a haphazard manner, on the spur of the moment. They are the called "according to His purpose," v. 28. This purpose is brought out in vv. 29, 30. Those whom He foreknew He would predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son, would call, would justify, would glorify. The apostle v. 30 uses the aorist, not as though God had elected only those who already in time had been called, justified, glorified. The aorist is to bring out the infallibility of God's election, which in some had already accomplished its purpose, that of eternal glorification of body and soul, while the glorification of those still living at the time of this writing and those who would in future be called was to be regarded by them all as so assured as if it had already been accomplished, as if they already had been glorified. That faithful God whose grace and calling are without repentance, by whom they were called unto the fellowship of His Son, will also confirm them unto the end. He will do it, Rom. 11, 29; 1 Cor. 1, 8, 9; 1 Thess. 5, 23, 24. Hence the elect of v. 33 are the believing children of God of all times and places.

The apostle also informs us as to the motives which prompted God to predestinate the elect. He was not moved to this choice by anything in man, by man's works, character, etc. Even the choice of Jacob rather than of Esau as the ancestor of the Old Testament people was not according to works, chap. 9, 11, 12; and the election unto eternal life of the remnant of Israel, the true children of God among Israel, is not of works, but of grace, 11, 5, 6. This election, however, is not an absolute decree, an arbitrary act of God. While there was nothing in man that God took into consideration, He did consider something in Himself, *viz.*, His decree to send His Son into the world as the Redeemer of mankind. We are elected in Christ, Eph. 1, 4. Him God had chosen, elected, Is. 42, 1; Acts 2, 23; 4, 28; Rev. 14, 8, to be the Savior. In this

Christ, because of His vicarious atonement, God elected, predestinated, those whom He foreknew, those whom He chose to elect according to the good pleasure of His will, Eph. 1, 5, 6.

These are the elect of whom the apostle is speaking here, the absence of the article denoting the quality of being elect, so that we might translate "such as are chosen, elect." They are *God's* elect. We were chosen not by fallible man, unable to finish all his plans, nor by angels, created beings of limited power, who have no jurisdiction over heaven. We were chosen by God, the Lord of heaven, Himself, who is God indeed, omnipotent, unchanging, ever gracious, ever wise, ever able to carry out His intentions, cp. Is. 40, 26, 27.

If this God has made any person one of His elect, who shall lay anything to the charge of such a one? There are indeed plenty of enemies trying to accuse us before God. There is Satan, Rev. 12, 10; there is the Law, John 5, 45; there is our own heart, Rom. 2, 15; 1 John 3, 20; there are our fellow-men, who time and again confront us with accusations and bring their charges before God's throne. Yet the apostle says there is no one who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect. Why not? Have they not sinned? Have they not transgressed the commandments of that very God? Folly it would be to deny it. Are they, then, not chargeable? May not accusations be brought against them and rightly so? No, says the apostle. How is that possible? The answer, "God the Justifying!" Note the strong emphasis on *God*, increased by the repetition, θεοῦ: θεός, the θεοῦ at the end of the sentence speaking of the accusations, the θεός at the beginning of the sentence speaking of justification. *God*, that is the end of all efforts to lay anything to the charge of the elect; *God*, that is the beginning, the sum and substance, of their justification. No man would dare to do that; that is something God alone can do and actually does. As we are *God's* elect, so we are *God's* justified, justified, however, not by an absolute decree. God did not simply overlook, cancel, forget about, the sins and wrong-doings of His elect. Such an attitude would conflict with His eternal, unchanging righteousness and justice, Ps. 5, 4, 5; Eph. 2, 3; Rom. 5, 10 (enemies, those against whom the enmity of God is directed). Neither does God justify because of some good quality in man. The apostle had vigorously denied the possibility of any good in man, Rom. 1. 2. He had summed up his findings in Rom. 3, 9 and again vv. 19—23. God justifies by *grace*, free grace, for Christ's sake, 3, 24, 25, 27, 28. In this manner He declares His unchanging righteousness, makes it possible for Himself to be and remain the Just One and the Justifier of the ungodly, 4, 5; 5, 18, and to apply this justification to all that believe in Jesus, 3, 26.

God, the Justifying. Paul does not use the aorist participle, since he does not refer to the objective justification, embracing all men, pronounced on Calvary, Rom. 5, 18; 2 Cor. 5, 19, or to the subjective justification, which took place when man was converted, brought to faith in Him that justifieth the ungodly, Rom. 4, 5; nor does he use the future participle, as though he referred only to the final justification on the great day of Judgment, Matt. 25, 34 ff. He uses the present participle, which indicates that this justifying act is an enduring, a continuous act. No matter how often the elect of God have sinned, no matter how often they are charged by their enemies before the throne of God in the hope of finally gaining a hearing, there is no prosecutor, be he human, be he a spirit, that can successfully press his claim against the elect. All their efforts to lay a charge against them must fall flat. Why? God is justifying them all the time, daily, hourly, every moment of their lives. Sin on the part of the elect and charges on the part of their enemies can be no more continuous than justification on the part of God. A truth almost too precious to believe! A grace beyond human understanding, made possible only through the all-satisfying vicarious atonement of the Son of God. Because of this work of Christ we can apply the words of the prophet to our justification also: "Hast thou not known? Hast thou not heard that the everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary? There is no searching of His understanding," Is. 40, 28. Cp. Rom. 5, 20 b. 21.

Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us, v. 34. It is immaterial whether we read the present or future participle, since the future would be the logical future and would not place the condemnation into the future nor restrict it to the final condemnation. *Κατακρίνειν*, literally to judge down from one's high position, judge against, hence condemn. Again there are plenty of such as condemn the believers. The enemies advancing their charges against them have already prejudged their case, have already pronounced the sentence of guilt and punishment upon them. Again their condemnation, their verdict, is of no effect, will not, cannot, harm the elect. As v. 33 denied their right to charge them with any wrong because there was no guilt, so v. 34 denies them the right to condemn because the punishment has already been borne, punitive justice has been satisfied. Four facts indisputably prove that, two lying in the past, two pertaining to the present and future, all four accomplished by none other than Christ, and every one accomplished for us, in our interest, the triumphant, emphatic *ὡς ἐν ἡμῶν* at the end of the sentence referring to every one of the four items. The first fact is,

Christ died. Paul had already brought out the vicarious character of that death with such clarity that a mere reference to it would call to the mind of the readers all that it implied. Cp. 3, 24, 25; 4, 24, 25; 5, 6—21; etc.

Yea rather, that is risen again. He does not mean to deny the efficacy of Christ's death, but even that death would not have been able to save us, had it not been the death of Him who was raised again, ἐγερθεῖς. "The apostle improves upon an expression which has not conveyed all that was in his mind." (*Expositor's Greek Testament*.) By recalling Christ to life, by raising Him, God has declared that His death is a sufficient payment for the sins of mankind, that now His outraged justice has been completely satisfied, that therefore there is no more condemnation to any one who would accept that vicarious death as his own.

Who is even at the right hand of God. Our Proxy, who was delivered because of our offenses, who was willing to bear all our penalties, is now at the right hand of God, absolved from all guilt, freed from all penalty. Who, then, shall condemn us, those for whom He performed His work of suffering? Who, then, shall condemn us for a guilt which no longer exists, which God Himself has canceled? Else would the Sin-bearer now stand at the right hand of Him who is the Holy One? Who can condemn us, what penalty, what wrath, what displeasure, on the part of God need we fear if He that was bruised for our iniquities, upon whom lay the chastisement of our peace, now is no longer a suffering servant, but the glorified Lord? Or do you still doubt that no one can condemn us? Behold, there stands He *who also maketh intercession for us*. Also, on top of all that He has done and is doing, He pleads for us. Ἐντυγχάνειν, to fall in with a person, to meet a person for the purpose of conversation, deliberation, supplication, etc. Christ stands at the right hand of God, not idle, not mute. He has placed Himself there for a purpose, namely, of conversing with His Father on our behalf, of telling Him that He died for us, that He was raised for our justification, that He stands at God's right hand for us; that there is now no condemnation to those who are in Christ Jesus, their Lord and Savior. And He pleads not as one who is subordinate to the Father, whose plea therefore is no more than "a request, properly so called," as Meyer holds. He speaks as One standing at the right hand of His Father, as One who is His equal, as One who has the right to say to His Father, "Father, I will," I purpose, I am determined, "that they also whom Thou hast given Me be with Me where I am," John 17, 24.

The whole work of Christ, from His conception to His final surrender of the Kingdom, 1 Cor. 15, 24, is a work on our behalf, for us: in the past His death and resurrection; now and to the end

of time, His being at the right hand of God for us, making also intercession for us. Who can condemn us? Whether we live or die, though our bodies lie moldering in the grave and shall be turned to dust and ashes, though it may seem as if we, like the unbelievers, had tasted death, had suffered the penalty of our sins, at the right hand of God stands He who died and was raised again, our Advocate, who is at the same time the Propitiation for our sins. Who shall condemn?

Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? V. 35. Luther, Sinaiticus, and some minuscules read "the love of God"; Vaticanus, "the love of God in Christ Jesus"; most manuscripts, "the love of Christ." It does not matter which variant we accept. The love of God is the love manifested in Christ; the love of Christ is the love of God. The saving love of God and Christ is here meant. The genitive, of course, is not the objective, but the subjective, God's love toward us. The apostle names seven experiences which might seem to separate the elect of God, the believing children of God (for of them alone he speaks here; cp. vv. 33. 28—31), from the love of Christ. Θάλασς, a pressing together, oppression, tribulation; the general term, including all that follows, and the general fate of all followers of Christ, John 16, 33; Acts 14, 22. Στενωχώρα, narrowness of place, straits, where one cannot escape the pressure, which renders it the more oppressive, the harder to bear, distress. On the difference in the connotation of the two words cp. 2 Cor. 4, 8, "troubled, . . . yet not distressed."

Persecution, again the common lot of all believers, John 15, 20; 2 Tim. 3, 12, so hard to bear. Cp. Smalcald Articles, *De Potestatu*, etc., § 42. *Hunger, nakedness*. While fleeing from persecution, only small food supplies and less clothing could be taken along in order to guard against hunger, to protect against wind and weather, Mark 13, 15. 16. *Peril*, danger, of loss of property, of life and limb. *Sword*, metonymically used for a violent death, the death of a criminal, a shameful death. Note the climax, first in the two general terms, tribulation and distress, then in the five concrete forms of these tribulations and distresses, beginning with persecution; that will lead to shortage of food; gradually one's clothing will wear out; then comes danger of sickness as a result of undernourishment and lack of clothing, this weakness increasing the never-ceasing peril of falling into the hands of the enemies; and finally death. A sorry lot indeed! Yet in spite of all this the apostle raises the triumphant shout: *Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?* Both here and in v. 39 he uses the word χωρίζειν. Χώρα means a space lying between two objects; χωρίζειν, to create

a space between, to part, to separate, a term used quite frequently of the separation, the divorce, of married people. Note the emphatic form of the question. Paul does not ask, Shall anything cause the love of Christ to cease? No; who shall separate *us* from the love of Christ? God's love, Christ's love, extends to all mankind, John 3, 16; Luke 19, 10. But there is no union, there is rather still a space intervening, between this love and the unbeliever. The unbeliever and Christ have not yet been joined together. That union is effected only through faith, John 14, 23; 17, 20—23; 1 John 4, 15. And since every true Christian should firmly believe that he is one of God's elect, vv. 28—31, he should confidently and without the slightest doubt or hesitation exclaim, Who shall separate *me* from the love of Christ?

Satan and his allies seek to create a space between us and this love by severing the bond of our union with the love of God through depriving us of our faith. It was Satan who asked for permission to test Job's faith, Job 1, 2; Satan, who spoke through Job's wife, Job 2, 9; Satan, who desired to sift Peter as wheat, Luke 22, 31; Satan, who goeth about to devour by creating afflictions, tribulations, etc., 1 Pet. 5, 9, 10. His purpose is to sever the believers from the love of Christ, to destroy their faith, which is the only bond uniting them with this love. This fiery trial is not to be regarded as something strange, unusual. No, says the apostle, that is to be expected. *As it is written, For Thy sake we are killed all the day long; we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter*, v. 36. The apostle quotes Ps. 44, 22 to prove that suffering is the general lot of the believers. But though believers, as the context shows, vv. 9—16, are sorely tried, though Satan seeks to tell them that they are cast off from the love of God, v. 9, yet because they are suffering "for Thy sake," for the sake of their Savior and God, vv. 1—8, their heart is not turned back, vv. 17—21. In the strength of their God they are conquerors, vv. 23—26. Therefore the apostle, as though taking up the refrain of this psalm of old, bursts forth into the paean of victory:

Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through Him that loved us, v. 37. Nay, ἀλλά, on the contrary. Though vv. 35 b and 36 are true, that shall not separate us from Christ's love; rather are we more than victors through Him that loved us. The aorist participle ἀγαπήσαντος "denotes the act of love *kat' exochen* which Christ accomplished by the sacrifice of His life" (Meyer). He that loved us and gave Himself for us is He that permits these afflictions to come to us for reasons which His wisdom and His love deem sufficient. Ought we ever to doubt His love? Why should we not trust Him indeed that the afflictions must work together for good unto us? He has foretold them, v. 36; John

16, 1—4; why should we be offended or doubt His love if they do happen to us? Moreover, He that sends them is He through whom we are made conquerors, yea, more than conquerors. That is the purpose of our afflictions sent by Him, and this very purpose bespeaks His ever-continuing love toward us, His desire to glorify us in a manner similarly as He Himself was glorified — through conflict to conquest, through battle to victory, through cross to crown. There is no special honor in defeating a weak and puny opponent. But to vanquish a strong, resourceful, wily enemy, to battle through to victory in spite of blackened eyes and aching limbs and bruised body, that is a conquest worthy of the name. Such conquerors we cannot be by our own strength. "With might of ours can naught be done." Relying on our own flesh, we should be found shirkers, disgraceful losers. We are conquerors alone through Him who loved us. In Him we have righteousness and strength, Is. 45, 24; 40, 30, 31. Yes, through Him we are more than conquerors, supervictors, not merely because we are victors in a battle which requires superhuman strength, but because our conquest is not only a bare victory, on the contrary, a super-victory, like unto the victory that He gained over all His enemies, in whose power and by whose aid we utterly rout all our foes, tread them under foot, make a show of them openly, triumphing over them through Christ, glorying in tribulation, Rom. 5, 3; Acts 5, 41; 16, 25; 1 Thess. 1, 6, 7; Phil. 1, 28—30; 2 Tim. 4, 7, 8. Hymn 273, 4. Who could call that a separation from the love of Christ?

It cannot be otherwise. We shall not be separated from the love of Christ. We are more than conquerors; "*for I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus, our Lord,*" vv. 38, 39. "I am persuaded" expresses "the apostle's personal conviction" (*Expositor's Greek Testament*); but there is no reason why every Christian may not make this conviction his own, just as little as the "I reckon" of v. 18 is not to be confined to the apostle exclusively. V. 31 he had said, "What shall we then say?" and that includes everything up to v. 39. There is no indication that the apostle has gained this conviction by special revelation. Every Christian may and should be just as triumphantly sure of his salvation as he. *Neither death*, referring back to "sword," the last word in the first list. No death, be it ever so painful and shameful, *nor life* with all its vicissitudes, its joys and sorrows, its dangers and pitfalls, *nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers*, no angelic spirit, no matter how highly exalted he may be, to which of the various ranks of angels he may belong, may separate us from the love of God. The

apostle speaks here as he does Gal. 1, 8, conditionally, even if it were possible that these good spirits should so far forget their duty, Heb. 1, 14, as to do the very opposite, this will not part us from God's love. *Nor things present, nor things to come*, be they what they may, *nor height, nor depth*, neither confinement on the highest mountain peak nor in deepest dungeon, death in bowels of the earth or in unfathomed depths of the sea (compare by way of contrast Amos 9, 1—3), *nor any other creature*, nothing in all creation, *shall separate us from the love of God*, the love of the almighty, unchanging, ever faithful Rock of Ages, the love *which is in Christ Jesus, our Lord*. Christ, the official name, denoting Him as our Prophet, Priest, and King; Jesus, that name all other names above, the name that saves us; Lord, Owner, by virtue of creation and redemption. *Our*, ἡμῶν, the final word of this majestic chapter, as assuring and comforting as it is full and sonorous, keeps ringing in our ears as a lasting, unforgettable memento of the precious things we have heard. *Our*, all that Christ, Jesus, Lord, implies, is *ours, mine*. Who, then, shall separate us, who shall separate *me*, from the love of God, since it is love in Christ Jesus the Lord of *ours, of mine*? Trust Him to perform that good work which He has begun.

A strictly analytical outline would unfold the rich content of this passage in the following manner: *If God Be for Us, who Shall Be against Us?* 1. Who shall lay anything to our charge? 2. Who is he that condemneth? 3. Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? — In the introduction one may speak of uncertainty as one of the most dreadful, nerve-racking sensations. Rather face the worst than constantly live in harassing doubt. In spiritual matters uncertainty is fatal. There is no uncertainty in Paul's triumphant hymn. Theme: *The Certainty of Our Salvation Is a Certainty of Faith*. 1. A certainty of faith (based neither on our works nor on an absolute decree, but on the Scriptural doctrine of justification, v. 35, of Christ's work, v. 34, of God's almighty, gracious love, vv. 35. 39). 2. A certainty of faith. (Who shall charge? v. 33; condemn? v. 34; separate? v. 35 ff. "I am persuaded," v. 38 f.) — *We Are More than Conquerors through Christ*. 1. Conquerors over all that dares to accuse and condemn us; 2. conquerors over all trials and tribulations. — *The Comfort the Doctrine of Election Offers*. 1. No one can accuse or condemn us. 2. No one can separate us, etc. — *Nothing can Separate Us from the Love of Christ*. 1. Not our sins, vv. 33. 34. Only believe! 2. Not trials and temptations, v. 35 ff. Trust your God and Savior! — *Christ's Work the Firm Foundation of Our Salvation*. 1. He died and rose for us. 2. He intercedes for us. 3. He protects us in all trials. To Him all glory!

T. LAETSCH

Outlines on the Eisenach Epistle Selections

Sixth Sunday after Trinity

ACTS 8, 26—38

The Bible tells us of God's vengeance upon His enemies, e. g., Pharaoh, Saul, Judas, etc.

But this same Bible tells us also of God's gracious work of salvation. Naaman, Thomas, Paul, etc. That is a Christian's delight to hear and behold how God graciously rescues those whom Satan has misled and ensnared. And these narratives are not only interesting and beautiful, but they are very instructive. They answer our prayer "Show me Thy ways, O Lord; teach me Thy paths," Ps. 25, 4. Now, here in our text we have such a helpful and precious narrative. It tells us

How God Saved the Ethiopian

1. He gave him the Word of God.

a) We do not know just how this Ethiopian down there in Africa had learned of the Word of God, but in His own way God had brought it to him. Perhaps some Israelite had told this Ethiopian of the hope of Israel. While there were many careless people in Israel who paid very little attention to their duty of publishing God's Word, there were always some who told others about the Messiah of Israel. It was just in this way that the Wise Men of the East had heard of the Star of Jacob and came up to Jerusalem to worship Him. God ever had His "other sheep" who were not of the fold of the Hebrews, and these "other sheep" God never neglected. Through His missionaries, the believers, who, like that little Hebrew maid in Naaman's household (2 Kings 5, 3), remembered to tell the heathen of the precious truths which God had given to Israel, many of these strangers from the commonwealth of Israel were found and drawn to their Savior.

b) That is God's way to this day. When a soul is to be saved, that soul must be made acquainted with God's Word. Salvation is to be accepted by faith, but: Rom. 10, 14. Just as God has decided to quench our thirst through water, to satisfy our hunger by proper food, so it pleased Him to reveal Himself and His salvation to us *through His Word*. If any one is to be saved, God's Word must be brought to him, or he must be brought to God's Word. Wherever we read of souls saved, we read that they were saved through the Gospel. Therefore God has told us to preach the Gospel in all the world and has promised that all they who believe it shall be saved and receive remission of sins. Rom. 1, 16; 1 Pet. 1, 23.

Application.—Let us be sure to appreciate this Word, to use it diligently, and to spread it, so that it may reach those who are still without this light.

2. *God saved this Ethiopian by sending to him a teacher.*

a) He told the deacon Philip to go to him. Though the Ethiopian read the Scriptures, revered this Word of God, yet he did not fully understand it. There was many a perplexing question which gave him much uneasiness and torture of soul. Therefore God gave him a teacher who explained the Scripture to him, v. 35. Oh, what burdens, what perplexities, what doubts, were taken from this Ethiopian through the explanation, the teaching, and the preaching of Philip.

b) It is true, the Word of God as we find it in the Scriptures is the power of God unto salvation. But the Good Shepherd is filled with such ardent love for our souls that He has done more than to give us the written Word. He also gives us teachers who proclaim this Word, Eph. 4, 11, 12. He has instituted the holy ministry that men should give themselves wholly to the study of God's Word and then proclaim it and teach it to all, believers and unbelievers, Titus 1, 5. These teachers are to do what Philip does here, serve God and His elect, by teaching, by explanation, by refuting error, and by confirming the truth through pertinent application of the Word of God. And the Lord wants all men to hear His ministers who proclaim His Word, Luke 10, 16. God wants preachers, calls preachers, sends preachers, because it has pleased Him by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe, 1 Cor. 1, 21.

Application. — By establishing the Christian ministry, God has shown His love for you. Be sure that you appreciate and use properly this gift of God. Accept the pastor's ministrations, his teaching, explanation, warning, and direction, also his reproof if that be necessary. And remember, when he is speaking God's Word to you, you are hearing not the minister's wisdom, you are hearing God's wisdom.

3. *He seals the Ethiopian in Baptism.*

a) V. 36. Philip had not only spoken in general about the Gospel, but he had told the Ethiopian also about the Sacraments. And the Ethiopian did not say, I believe in Jesus now, I have heard the Word of God, and that is all I need. No; he recognized the preciousness of this message and learned that God wants to seal us, confirm our faith, and enter into a covenant relation with us through Baptism. As soon as they came to a place where there was water, he requested to be baptized, and Philip by the command of God baptized him. The Ethiopian made a beautiful confession of his faith and was received by adoption through Baptism into the family of God.

b) Here again we see the great loving-kindness of the Good Shepherd. Not only does He give us the Word, not only does He

send us teachers, but He has also given us a visible means of grace, baptism with water, whereby He assures us that, as certainly as we are baptized, so certain we may be that we have a gracious God and that God has through this Sacrament adopted us into His family as His beloved children. In the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper He gives us His body and His blood to confirm us in our faith in the redemption of Christ, not with gold or silver, but with His holy, precious blood and with His innocent suffering and death.

Application. — Do you often think of your baptism and what it means to you and what a high honor, what a precious gift, God has bestowed upon you through this Sacrament? Are you found at the Lord's Table frequently? Do not look upon your attendance upon the Sacrament as a part of the Law, as a painful duty, but look upon it as a means whereby God wishes to confirm you in your faith and bestow upon you His most precious gift, the Holy Spirit, forgiveness of your sin, and power against the foes that would destroy you for time and eternity. See, then, in this whole narrative a picture of how God also deals with you graciously and mercifully.

MARTIN S. SOMMER

Seventh Sunday after Trinity

1 TIM. 6, 6—12

The key-note for this sermon is in the word *αὐτάρχεια* ("contentment"), v. 6, and the introduction should familiarize the audience with that thought. Perhaps I would say that there are two kinds of contentment. One is the rocking-chair kind, which says: "Oh, well, we must take what comes; whatever is to be will be, and there is no use worrying." The other is a far more active thing, and that is the kind our text refers to. It is the exercise of an intelligent mind which does not lose its equanimity and self-control in any situation and always regains and retains the dominant note of joy and love. If time permitted, I might illustrate from the characters of Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius, who from the standpoint of pagan philosophy exhibited remarkable mastery of themselves, the one in extreme weakness and poverty and the other in the abundance of power and wealth.

The Self-Mastery that Befits a Christian

1. The importance of this virtue
2. The struggle it entails

1

Vv. 6—10 give ample material for this part of the sermon. In v. 5 St. Paul speaks of false teachers who follow religion for profit. What an odious thing in any professing Christian! Cf. Balaam. Often people turn to religion for the "better luck" it is expected to

bring them or for mere social or business reasons. The story of John 6 gives occasion for observation and introspection. We readily denounce the thing in others and may be very blind to our own sins in this respect.

But certainly v. 6 is true where the practise of piety is connected with perfect self-mastery no matter what befalls. Phil. 4, 11—13. There are far greater values than those which clothing, food, and money represent. Matt. 6, 25 b.

And is not v. 7 true? (Eccl. 5, 15; Ps. 49, 17.) Hence v. 8. (Present this and all the sermon as a gracious instruction of our heavenly Father, who loves us for Christ's sake.) Heb. 13, 5.

V. 9. They that set their minds on acquiring riches fall into temptations and snares, into lusts that are foolish and bring disgrace and are hurtful and destructive to happiness, both in your own case and in the case of those who follow your example. These lusts drown, submerge, you in ruin of body and soul. Hence be wise; v. 10: The love of money is a mean and debasing thing, the root of all evil. Many Christians have reached out after it and have erred from the faith. By degrees that evil propensity has turned them farther and farther away, and they have only reaped heartache.

By such contrast you see the importance of that contentment by which the Christian evidences his high position as a child of God. To serve is better than to have. The craving to have and the mere having do not bring happiness. To be envied indeed is the person whose heart, in the rich possession of God's grace, is set genuinely on serving and who thinks correspondingly little of having.

2

But this frame of mind calls for a struggle and is not attained without it. They who take it lightly will not attain. The difficulty lies within you. Be alert, vigilant, awake. Your Christian faith is no mere sentence to be stored in your mind for occasional reference, but it calls for vigorous exercise. 1 Tim. 4, 8.

V. 11. First there are things to flee, just as a soldier must flee things that debilitate, enfeeble, deceive, benumb, him and put him off his guard. Flee the love of money! — Then exercise yourself in, and pursue, those things that make for Christian self-control, so that every ounce of your physical, mental, and spiritual energy is at the command of your regenerated mind. Strive for righteousness and holiness (a piety that is honest in behavior), for faith and love (these two must be inseparable), for patience and meekness (pride at once ruins and prevents persevering contentment).

V. 12 gives excellent occasion for vigorous *ad hominem* exhortation. Note that it calls for a fight of faith, the Christian faith,

faith in Jesus Christ, our Savior. It is a fight against the insidious things that would rob you of your faith, such as greed, discontent, murmuring, complaining. Your faith is the victory over all that. Faith fights and wins. 2 Tim. 2, 5; Eph. 6, 10—18. Lay hold even now, like a winner in a race, upon the prize which the Lord holds out to you. The Lord Himself will uphold you by these very instructions and encouragements. Remember how He has helped you in the past, how you felt His power within you in the hour of your baptism or your confirmation or when you made a sincere confession of your faith. Be true to that, live that. Heb. 4, 14 c; 10, 23.

O you child of God, you have been called to a high and noble life and to a wealth which far exceeds any earthly riches. Live that life; be true to yourself; be a consistent Christian. H. M. ZORN

Eighth Sunday after Trinity

Acts 16, 16—34

Ps. 19, 7. Yes, the preaching of the Gospel of Jesus Christ makes a difference, brings about a change. That is why St. Paul writes to the Corinthians concerning drunkards, thieves, adulterers, liars, etc., and adds: 1 Cor. 6, 11. Word and Sacrament effected the change in the Corinthians. Only the influence and the power of the Word can satisfactorily explain the transformation in a few years of man-eating savages into civilized human beings. Let us take note today of

The Wondrous Power of the Gospel

We shall consider

1. *From what depths of sin and despair it rescues*
2. *To what heights of faith and joy it exalts*

1

We find in Philippi the spirit of crass *materialism, covetousness, love of money*. Briefly narrate vv. 9—15. When Paul went to the place of prayer again, a maid, a slave-girl, who had a spirit of divination, followed him. She was possessed of a devil. Though this was a terrible calamity to this poor damsel, her affliction proved a source of revenue to her greedy owners, for she brought them much gain by soothsaying. — As in the days of His flesh the spirits recognized Christ, calling Him the Son of God, so the demon in this poor girl caused her to call after Paul and his companions for many days, v. 17. A true testimony indeed, but no doubt one intended to harm the cause of the Gospel. At last Paul drove out the evil spirit. But this miracle of mercy was responsible for his suffering in that city and of his being compelled to leave Philippi.—

Is not the spirit of these owners of the slave-girl common with us? Materialism is the order of the day; love of money is men's obsession. Innumerable people are like Israel of old; they worship the golden calf of earthly gain. Such men have not as yet come under the blessed influence of the Word of God, or they have turned away from the Lord.

When the masters of the girl saw that their hope of gain was gone, they displayed a *spirit of bitter antagonism* towards the messengers of Christ. "Touch a man's pocketbook, and very frequently you touch the only sensitive spot he has about him." Paul and Silas were drawn to the market-place and taken to the magistrates. And now listen to the hypocrisy of their persecutors: vv. 20. 21. What downright perversion of the truth! Paul had proclaimed the only message that can make men happy, had freed a poor girl from a life of wretchedness, but had in no wise troubled the city. But the mob spirit was incited, vv. 22—24. Where was the famed Roman justice? — Is not this the way of the world and of the devil, who rules the children of this world? They hate the Gospel of Jesus and the messengers of the true God. Their cause is lost when tried on its merits, and so they resort to violence, lies, slanders, and persecution to remove those whose testimony is unpleasant to them. In our country men may shrink from using physical force, but they resort to the same hypocrisy, deception, slander, and persecution to harm Christ's cause and those who espouse it.

Our text directs our attention particularly to the Philippian jailer, vv. 24—27. In blank *despair* the jailer was ready to fall upon his sword, to kill himself. That is the spirit of unbelief, of the ungodly man. He flies to suicide before he ever knows whether misfortune has befallen him or not. This was true Roman doctrine. "Cassius, when defeated, covered his face and ordered his freedman to kill him in his tent near Philippi." That is the wisdom of the world, all its comfort, when its earthly castles of fortune are wrecked. It was the only way out for Judas and Ahithophel, and it is seemingly still the only recourse of the heathen in Japan and elsewhere. Thus men plunge themselves from darkest ignorance here into the eternal night of suffering hereafter. That is the spirit of men without the Gospel of Jesus Christ: the spirit of crass materialism, of violent opposition to the Gospel, of blank despair. But with the Gospel there is Christian fortitude, cheerful witness-bearing, joy in suffering, humble acknowledgment of sin, and fervent trust in the Lord Jesus and His promises.

2

What a contrast do the apostles present in this story! They knew the dangers confronting them; yet they hesitated not to preach the message of Jesus and His love, to the Jews first, but

with the end in view of reaching the population of the city in general. It was an unwelcome endorsement of their activities which they received from that evil spirit, v. 17, but it was the truth for all that. They had but one purpose in life, to show men the way to salvation. There can be no more exalted task in life. And now behold their Christian courage and fortitude amid trials and tribulations. Their bodies still bleeding from the merciless beating of the lictors, their feet in stocks, these two men in the dungeon did not give way to weeping and lamenting. No; v. 25. That is the blessed influence of the Gospel. When men have found their Savior and learned to trust in Him, they are content to suffer wrong for His sake; they can be patient in tribulation and rejoice in hope. Do these two men in prison not put you and me to shame when we sing a song of lamentation because of the burdens of life? Instead of praying we worry; instead of rejoicing we weep; instead of singing songs of rejoicing we complain. Go to that dungeon and learn to say with St. Paul: "Most gladly will I rather glory in mine infirmities that the power of Christ may rest upon me," 2 Cor. 12, 9.

Observe also the marvelous change wrought in that jailer of Philippi. His attempted suicide was frustrated by the quick action of Paul, v. 28. The Spirit of God was at work in his heart. Here was a man at the brink of despair, not merely because he feared the loss of his job, but because there had awoke in his heart a most terrible consciousness of his sin and just punishment due him. He actually saw hell open. Hence he asked the question. He knew that he needed salvation. And they gave him the most glorious answer ever given to that question, the only correct advice to be offered to a sin-sick soul, v. 31. Accept in humble faith that Son of God, that Substitute of sinners. The moment you accept Him you have peace with God, assurance of forgiveness and the certain hope of heaven. V. 32—34. Despair had been changed to childlike trust, fear to rejoicing; an unbelieving heathen had been turned into a believing Christian. — 'Tis ever thus. The Gospel is the power of God unto salvation. Without it there can be no happiness, no joy, no peace, but only sin and wickedness and sorrow and discouragement. You may envy the unbeliever today; he may seem so much happier than you; but his death is horrible, leading him to eternal ruin. Which do you choose? A life with or without the Gospel? Surely one with the Gospel. Then use it; accept it; live according to it, not only for yourself, but see that your whole house is under the spell of the Word. Make your religion a family religion. Thou shalt be saved and thy house. Above all, thank God that you have the answer to that question of questions as to the way of salvation, and show your gratitude by bending every effort to have others learn that answer and finally be saved.

PAUL KOENIG

world. Like Paul we should use our opportunity to do so (our daily contact with our neighbors while about our business, while traveling, etc., John 4). When we find cities and districts that have no church at all or no Lutheran church, we ought to look upon that as a missionary opportunity. We should not neglect the distant lands of Asia, Africa, and South America. When the Macedonian cry: "Come over and help us," Acts 16, 9. 10, is heard, we should not turn a deaf ear to it. Even now, as in Athens, some may be attracted to us and our mission efforts by mere curiosity, vv. 19—21; but let us, as Paul did, "cash in" on that.

2

a) Paul preached the Gospel in spite of much opposition. The Jews were not friendly towards Paul, vv. 5. 13. The Epicureans and the Stoics were not friendly toward him; they called him a "babbler," "a setter forth of strange gods," v. 18. (The preacher should study, and in a popular way present, the philosophy of the Epicureans and Stoics.) The Athenians as such were not friendly toward Paul; they mocked, v. 32.

b) Paul remained undaunted in the face of opposition. He disputed, discussed, reasoned, with the people daily, v. 17. He met the challenge to speak in the very midst of Mars Hill, where the philosophers and learned were assembled, vv. 19. 22.

We are often too timid, even ashamed at times, to confess. We fear ridicule, mockery, Matt. 26, 69 ff.; 10, 32. 33. May Paul's example inspire us to take courage! We are representing a good cause. We have the Lord on our side, Matt. 28, 20. We have a great blessing to bring to the world, the one thing that it needs.

3

a) Paul preached Jesus, v. 18. That is the Christian message; no other will save. The Church is a soul-saving institution. The Gospel is the means.

b) Paul adapted his message to the needs of his hearers. When he spoke to the Jews, he made his approach on the basis of their knowledge of the Old Testament Scriptures, showing that Jesus is the promised Messiah, Acts 13, 16—41. When Paul addressed the Athenians, who had no knowledge of the Old Testament, he made his approach on the basis of their natural knowledge of the existence of God. Over against the materialism, pantheism, and polytheism of Greece, Paul preached the *living God*. The Athenians worshiped many gods, but the true God was to them "the unknown god." This God, Paul declared unto them, v. 23. This true God is the Creator of the world, who can therefore not be confined to any temple made with hands, v. 24; nor can He be worshiped in the

Ninth Sunday after Trinity

Acts 17, 16-34

The Lord tells us Christians to preach the Gospel to a perishing world. There are millions of unchurched and heathen people. Are we personally speaking to those whom we can reach and sending workers to others (350 available ministerial candidates)? God has given to our people the necessary money. Why are we permitting the Church's work to suffer because of a lack of funds? God has for one hundred years kept for our Synod the Gospel in its truth and purity. Do we appreciate this blessing, and are we enthusiastic enough about it to let others share it with us? Do we lack consecration? Have we left our first love? Do we lack courage? Have we lost faith in the power of the Gospel? Do we no longer believe the Lord's promises? Do we realize that we are facing a serious situation? When the Jews despised the Gospel, the Lord took it from them and gave it to others. Will we likewise bring the curse of God down upon us? We need encouragement. The Lord of hosts has not yet forsaken us. He is still willing to use us in His service. In our text the Lord presents for our encouragement Paul in his missionary labors at Athens.

Paul at Athens a Mighty Encouragement for Us to Preach the Gospel to a Perishing World

1. *He grasped the opportunity to preach the Gospel*
2. *He remained undaunted in the face of severe opposition*
3. *He adapted his message to the needs of his hearers*

1

a) How the opportunity presented itself to Paul. Paul had just come from Berea to Athens. There he waited for Silas and Timothy. While waiting, "he saw the city wholly given to idolatry." "His spirit was stirred within him," chap. 17, 1. Paul was moved with compassion, cp. Matt. 9, 36. He saw an opportunity; he grasped it. The people at Athens were much in need of the Gospel.

b) How Paul grasped the opportunity. He first went to the synagogue and spoke to the Jews and the devout persons, i. e., the proselytes of the gate. To the Jews, God had first of all given His oracles, Rom. 1, 16; Acts 13, 46. They were given also the first Gospel opportunity. From the synagogue Paul went to the public market-place, v. 17, and from there to Mars Hill, v. 22. Paul spoke to the common people and to the learned; he passed none by.

The Lord does not say to us, "Wait," but He says, "Go," 1 Cor. 2, 14. The Lord does not send us to a few people or a certain class, but He says: "Go ye into all the world." The Lord does not tell us to convert the world, but He tells us to preach the Gospel to the

Miscellanea

Topics for Conference Papers

The following list of topics is offered in response to a request that we print a number of suggestions, especially for the use of smaller pastoral conferences, in which one may ordinarily expect a fair amount of discussion. For a bibliography covering these topics see the March number of the CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

Hermeneutics and Textual Criticism

The Problem of Conjectural Criticism

Copyists' Errors in the Psalter

To What Extent do Variants Influence the Understanding of the New Testament Text?

The Chief Hermeneutical Rules and the Pastor's Sermon Work

Biblical Isagogics

The *Logia Iesu* and the Canonical Gospels

The Problem of Rom. 16

The Author of the Epistle of St. James

The Author of the Letter to the Hebrews

The Alleged Interdependence of Second Peter and Jude

When was the Epistle to the Galatians Written?

The Gospel of St. John as the Product of His Old Age

The Close of the Old Testament Canon

English Bible

A Comparison of the Authorized Version with the Revised Version

A Comparison of the Authorized Version with the Most Prominent Modern Versions

Church History

Separatism in the Church of the First Century

How Luther Came to the Knowledge of the Truth

Specific Roman Errors Promulgated since the Council of Trent

Doctrinal Controversies in the Lutheran Church of America

The History of the *Freikirchen* in Germany

The "Fathers" of the Missouri Synod

"Biblische Zeitgeschichte," Archeology, and Related Subjects

The Corroboration of the Biblical Account by Recent Discoveries (Egypt, Ur, the Hittite Country, the Ras Shamra Tablets, etc.)

The Form of Worship in the Church before Nicaea

Recent Excavations and the Geography of the Bible

Contacts between the Jews and the Surrounding Heathen Nations

The Book of Daniel and the Period between the Testaments

Biblical Theology

First John as an Exposition of the Fourth Gospel

The Doctrine of the Church in Ephesians

The All-sufficiency of Christ according to Colossians

The Deity of Christ according to Hebrews

(A suggestion: Work through as many books of the Bible as possible on the basis of the original, carefully listing and explaining all the doctrines and then grouping them systematically.)

form of man-made idols, vv. 25. 29. The true God made all nations of one blood and made man a responsible being, who, although he cannot by nature know God, can know that the Godhead is not like unto gold, silver, or stone, graven by art or man's device, v. 29. God overlooked the ignorance of the heathen by suffering its debasing influence to develop, but now "commandeth all men everywhere to repent," etc., vv. 30. 31. All men will be brought to the judgment-seat of Christ, the very Christ who died on the cross for the sins of the world in order that all might in Him have eternal life. For all this, Christ's resurrection from the dead is God's positive assurance. Surely, those who hear the Gospel will have no excuse. It should also be noted that Paul calls attention to the fact that this entire world is not left to Stoical fate or Epicurean chance, but is governed by God, the Creator, according to His will and prearrangement, v. 26. (Paul's very fine line of argumentation in this Athenian address should be carefully studied.)

Like Paul we should preach Jesus and His pure Gospel of salvation. In our days of indifferentism, unionism, apostasy, this needs to be particularly stressed. 1 Cor. 1, 23. 24; Mark 16, 15; 2 Tim. 4, 2—4; John 8, 31. 32; Gal. 1, 6—10.

But, like Paul, we must adapt our message to the needs of our hearers, making our approach accordingly. When we speak to such as once were Christians, we can well remind them of what they learned from the Scriptures; but when we approach the people of this world and the worldly-wise, we may have to appeal to their natural knowledge of God, Rom. 1, 19. 20, to the Law written in their hearts and accusing their conscience, Rom. 2, 14. 15, and thus lead them on to a better understanding of the full Law of God, their responsibility to God, their utter sinfulness, the curse of God, so that they may be brought to a knowledge of their sins, Rom. 7, 7, for the purpose of then bringing to them the message of the Gospel and all its comforting sweetness.

Paul at Athens is an example to us of a preacher who had a compassion for souls and the courage fearlessly to preach the Word of God, the Gospel of salvation. Verily, the world needs such preachers today!

J. H. C. FRITZ



Apologetics and Polemics

Some Recent Abnormal Sects
The Menace of the Pentecostal Churches
An Examination of Recent Papal Decrees
Recent Attacks on Verbal Inspiration

It is understood, as a matter of fact, that small conferences will spend much time on exegetical and doctrinal papers. If these suggestions will prove of any value to the brethren, further lists may be furnished from time to time.

P. E. K.

Fragment of Old Testament Traced Back to before Christ

The world for three decades has possessed, without knowing it, a fragment of the Old Testament in Hebrew which was written before Christ, it has been determined by Dr. William F. Albright, professor of Semitic Languages at the Johns Hopkins University.

This fragment, the Nash Papyrus, long has been recognized as the oldest Hebrew copy of the Bible, but it was believed to date from the second century A. D. By examination of the Aramaic script in which it is written, however, Dr. Albright has discovered it is from a much earlier period.

It was written less than a century after the writing of the latest books of the Old Testament. This carries the tangible links with the writers of the Scriptures back to within four centuries of the time when the first five books of the Hebrew Bible were edited in their present form.

The Nash Papyrus was bought early this century by an Englishman, the late Walter L. Nash, secretary of the Society of Biblical Archeology, from natives of Egypt who dug it up with fragments of the *Odyssey*. He presented it to the Cambridge Museum.

In 1903 its significance was made known to the world through an announcement by Dr. Stanley A. Cook, professor of Hebrew at Cambridge University, that it dated from the second century A. D., making it the oldest extant fragment of the Hebrew Bible.

Since then, however, so many Aramaic writings of about the time of Christ and of an earlier period have been found, particularly by Dr. E. L. Sukenik of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, that a modern scholar is now much better equipped to place the relative ages of such documents, Dr. Albright observed yesterday.

The Nash Papyrus contains the Ten Commandments and the Shema Israel, that portion of Exodus which is used as a Jewish prayer. The version of the Decalog on it differs in a few non-essential points from the writings of which the King James Version of the Bible was a translation. The words "seventh day," for instance, are used instead of "Sabbath" in the Fourth Commandment.

Dr. Albright made his calculations by comparing the Aramaic script in this fragment with the script of earlier and later documents. This script, which was used by Palestinians writing both in Hebrew and Aramaic, changed from century to century; so it is possible by studying these changes to date the era in which a particular manuscript was produced.

Until recent discoveries there was little Hebrew material with which to compare it. There are a quantity of papyri and inscriptions on broken pieces of pottery dating from 500 to 200 B. C., these being mainly business documents and private letters, but no Biblical fragments. There is a hiatus in the remaining writings until about 50 B. C., when, until 70 A. D., many inscriptions are scribbled on stones and walls.

Between these two periods the writing of the Jews was mainly in Greek. Among the few Hebrew writings during this Greek period is a fragment discovered by Dr. Albright's expedition to South Judea several years ago.

The next oldest Hebrew Biblical writings to the Nash Papyrus are some scraps of papyri found in Egypt, dating from the third to the seventh century A. D. They contain only a word or two on each fragment, however, and are of practically no value to students.

The oldest manuscripts of the Bible in Hebrew, being extended portions of the Bible written on parchment, are three ninth-century texts and the famous Codex Petropolitanus, of 916 A. D., now in Leningrad.

Links with the Biblical past are turning up with some frequency in this day, Dr. Albright pointed out. This summer Dr. C. H. Roberts, an English scholar, discovered that certain Greek writings found in a mummy-case were several centuries older than the oldest previously known Greek fragments of the Bible. These contained parts of the text of Deuteronomy.

Papyrus, the writing material used by the early Egyptians, was made from the pith of the papyrus-reed, a common growth in the marshy sections of the Nile Valley.

Baltimore Sun, Oct. 21, 1936. Submitted
by Rev. F. A. Baepler

NOTE. — It is hardly probable that the Nash papyrus ever was part of a copy of the Pentateuch. The Ten Commandments are given in a form which apparently is a compilation of Ex. 20 and Deut. 5, followed by Deut. 6, 4, 5, but omitting Deut. 5, 22—33 and 6, 1b—3. The Shema Israel referred to above is found not in Exodus, but in Deut. 6, 4, 5. "It is not certain whether it was part of a copy of the Pentateuch or whether it was a lectionary or book of instruction or possibly a charm," says Barton, *Archeology and the Bible*, p. 568, where the papyrus is given in full. This, however, does not detract from the archeological value of the papyrus.

Stimmwählen in der apostolischen Zeit

Wir beziehen uns hier hauptsächlich auf Apost. 14, 23 und zitieren zunächst aus Pieper (Christliche Dogmatik, III, 516 f.): „Es wurde und wird gesagt, daß Apost. 14, 23 und Tit. 1, 5 nichts vom Verufen oder Wählen seitens der Gemeinde stehe, sondern im Gegenteil nur berichtet werde, was Paulus und Barnabas getan haben und Titus auf Paulus' Befehl tun sollte. Von einer Tätigkeit oder auch nur Mittätigkeit der Gemeinden sei dort nichts zu lesen. Mit Recht erinnert Luther: „Obgleich Paulus dem Titus befiehlt, daß er Priester ordne, so folgt doch daraus nicht, daß es Titus allein aus eigener Macht getan, sondern daß er sie nach dem Beispiel der Apostel durch des Volkes Abstimmung eingesetzt habe; sonst würden die Worte Pauli mit dem Beispiel der Apostel streiten.“ Zudem kommt durch das Apost. 14, 23

gebrauchte Wort $\chiειροτονησαντες$ klar zum Ausdruck, daß bei der Segnung der Ältesten eine Stimmenabgabe seitens der Gemeinde stattfand. Meyer übersetzt $\chiειροτονεω$ mit „stimmwählen“. Er bemerkt z. St.: „Paulus und Barnabas stimmwählten ihnen Presbyter, das heißt, sie leiteten deren Stimmwahl bei den Gemeinden.“ Zur Begründung dieser Übersetzung fügt Meyer hinzu: „Die Analogie von Apost. 6, 2—6 fordert diese Beachtung des gewählten Wortes, welches, von dem alten Wahlverfahren durch Händeaufhebung herrührend, im Neuen Testament nur hier und 2 Kor. 8, 19 vorkommt, und verbietet die allgemeine Fassung *constituebant* (Vulgata, Hammond, Kuinöl u. V.) oder *eligebant* (de Wette), so daß die Anstellung bloß durch apostolische Machtvollkommenheit geschehen wäre (Löhe). . . . Richtig Erasmus: *suffragiis delectos*. . . . Ganz eigenmächtig falsch Katholiken: es beziehe sich auf die $\chiειροθεσια$ bei Ordination der Presbyter.“ Auch hat die Segnung der öffentlichen Diener durch Gemeindewahl sich in der Kirche der ersten Jahrhunderte noch lange erhalten. Die Bemerkung in den Schmaikalbischen Artikeln (342, 70): „Vorzeiten wählte das Volk Pfarrherrn und Bischöfe“ ist als historisch richtig nachweisbar.“

In 2 Kor. 8, 19 liegt keine sonderliche Schwierigkeit vor, denn der Text sagt klar und deutlich: $\chiειροτονησεις$ und $των$ $ἐκκλησιων$, was Luther übersetzt „berordnet von den Gemeinden“ und die *Authorized Version* „chosen of the churches“. Hier handelt es sich ganz offenbar um stimmwählen von seiten der Gemeinde. Die Stelle Apost. 14, 23 bietet eine größere Schwierigkeit, weil das Verbum ein aktivisches Partizip ist, dessen Subjekt die Apostel sind und dessen indirektes Objekt $αυτοις$ ($κατ'$ $ἐκκλησιων$) ist. Luther übersetzt bekanntlich „ordneten ihnen hin und her Älteste in den Gemeinden“, während die englische Übersetzung lautet: „When they had ordained them elders in every church.“ Dies scheint anzudeuten, daß die Übersetzer an eine Tätigkeit der Apostel gedacht haben. In der Stelle Tit. 1, 5 steht ein anderes Verbum, nämlich $καταστησῃς$, was sich ohne Zweifel auf die formelle Bestellung der Gemeindeämter bezieht.

In den Kommentaren, die auf die Bedeutung von $\chiειροτονεω$ in Apost. 14, 23 eingehen, findet sich viel Unklarheit, wie wenn Knowling im *Expositor's Greek Testament* als erste Bedeutung des Wortes angibt „to elect by popular vote, by show of hands“, aber in der Ausführung über den Vers sich doch zu der Übersetzung „appoint“ zu neigen scheint, dann aber wieder einlenkt mit den Worten: „At the same time, it may be fully admitted that the church was not without some share in the election of the elders.“ Luthardt (in Strauß-Zöckler) gibt die Bedeutung *eligere*, ernennen, und sagt mit Bezug auf den Dativ, „daß den Aposteln bei dem Wahl die Initiative zukam“. Lechler (in Lange-Schaff) gibt die Bedeutung an „to raise the hands; to vote, elect, by stretching out the hands. The expression accordingly suggests the thought that the apostles may have appointed and superintended a congregational election. . . . Indeed, the very nature of the case would seem to have required that the apostles should be guided in their decision by public opinion and by the confidence reposed by the members of the congregation in certain individuals.“ Um nicht zu ermüden, zitieren wir aus den neuesten Kommentaren nur den von Lenski, der sich über das Verbum so ausspricht: „By using just this verb here, Luke would make an important point. For the question at issue is whether

Paul and Barnabas just chose these elders without congregational participation or whether they conducted a congregational meeting in which by show of hands a vote was taken, the congregation choosing with participation of the apostles and under their guidance. The latter is undoubtedly correct, just as the praying with fastings includes by no means only the two apostles, but each congregation as well. The method is fully explained in 6, 2—6. The point to observe is that both participles refer to the subject of *παρέδεντο*, to Paul and to Barnabas, and are thus used in a wide sense. The apostles presented the matter, had the eligible men named, had the vote by hands taken, and thus appointed those chosen, and ordained them as the elders."

Die hier vertretene Übersetzung und Auslegung verträgt sich jedenfalls am besten mit dem Gebrauch des Verbums *χειροτονεῖν* im nachapostolischen Zeitalter, namentlich bei Ignatius. Er gebraucht das Verbum im Briefe an die Philadelphier von der Gemeindevahl eines Diaconen (Kap. 10, 1), im Briefe an die Smyrner von der Wahl eines Gemeindevertreters (Kap. 11, 2) und im Briefe an Polycarp in derselben Weise (Kap. 7, 2). Ebenso klar ist der Gebrauch des Verbums in der „Didache“ (Kap. 15, 1), wo wir lesen: „Stimmwählt nun für euch selbst Bischöfe und Diaconen, die des Herrn würdig sind“ usw. Auf jeden Fall muß nach diesen Stellen gelten, daß die Übersetzung des Verbums „auf Grund einer Gemeindevahl bestimmen oder einsetzen“ in Apost. 14, 23 gute Gründe für sich hat. Darum wird das Obige zur Prüfung dargeboten.

P. E. A.

The Ecumenic Character of the True Church

As a number of communications received during the last years indicate, there is need for a careful study of the entire doctrine concerning the Church and all the teachings of the Scriptures which relate to this doctrine. This includes not only the Biblical doctrine of the *una sancta*, but also that of the so-called visible Church, the questions of unionism and separatism, the teaching of the Bible on the Christian ministry, on the call with reference to its scope and character, and similar points. It may be possible that the following aphoristic statements will be of some value in stimulating the study of the entire situation in all its ramifications. If the discussion of the early Lutheran dogmaticians seem to be too extensive and comprehensive for our restless age, the books on dogmatics by Pieper, Hoenecke, Mueller, Krauth, Schmid (Hay and Jacobs), and others may be consulted, also the following essays and articles: *Lehre und Wehre*, 1901 (April ff.), 1928 (December); synodical reports: Brazil, 1905; California and Nevada, 1904; Michigan, 1894; Nebraska, 1919; Southern Illinois, 1922; Southern, 1916.

The first point to be remembered is that the Church is *una sancta catholica*, that it is to be found throughout the world wherever there are persons who believe in Jesus Christ as their personal Savior and hence in the Triune God and in His revelation through the Word. The degree of knowledge and understanding of Scripture doctrines may vary widely, but where faith in the atonement is found, there we must assume membership in the holy Christian Church. Mark 16, 15, 16; Acts 10, 35.

In the second place, as our Lutheran Confessions and the exposition

of our synodical Catechism (Qu. 191) state, we speak also of *visible churches*, organizations which confess their adherence to the Bible, to the Triune God, and to the redemption wrought by Christ. The Reformed Church, the Presbyterian Church, the Baptist Church, the Methodist Church, and others, as at present constituted, are Christian churches as well as the Lutheran Church.

In the third place, we distinguish various *degrees in purity of doctrine*, on the basis of the official confessions of the churches concerned. The closer the confessions and declarations of a church-body are to the fundamental truths set forth in Scripture, such as the inspiration of the Bible, the doctrine of justification by faith alone, the deity of Christ, the vicarious atonement, the Trinity, and others which are necessary to salvation, the purer, as a rule, will be the teaching and preaching of such a church-body, also within its constituent congregations.

In connection with the last proposition, in the fourth place, we *distinguish* between the denial of *fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines*, not in the sense of setting aside or undervaluing any part of the Word of God, but with the understanding that some doctrines are more important for faith and life than others. It should also be understood that ignorance or inadequacy of understanding with regard to certain doctrines will not affect the position of a person in his Christianity, while a wilful denial of any truth of Scripture will destroy the obedience of faith.

In the fifth place, we *dare not condone any false doctrine* or attitude, either in confession or in practise. Men who presume to be teachers of the Church should be familiar with the entire *corpus doctrinae* as contained in Scripture, and all teaching contrary to the doctrine of Holy Writ must be rejected. Rom. 16, 17; 2 Thess. 3, 6; 2 John 10, 11.

In the sixth place, we *may not accuse any one of heresy* unless it definitely appears that he refuses to accept instruction from the Word of God and persists in his unscriptural position. As long as he is willing to receive instruction, we should be ready to admonish him as a brother, 2 Thess. 3, 15.

In the seventh place, we are to use all diligence that a *unity of the spirit* which actually exists is *acknowledged and kept*. Eph. 4, 3. In other words, we should exhaust every possibility to determine whether such a unity exists, lest we transgress a clear statement of Holy Writ in placing such as are truly brethren in the category of wilful deniers of the truth.

We should therefore, in the eighth place, leave nothing undone in endeavoring to *bring a brother who has erred from the truth back to the full acknowledgment* of the Scriptural position. Gal. 6, 1, 2; Jas. 5, 19, 20.

To summarize: As earnestly as we are to contend for the faith once delivered to the saints and avoid all unionistic and syncretistic tendencies, so sincerely are we to guard against any attitude which would be expressive of, or lead to, separatism and schism.

P. E. K.

Parochial Schools and Public Funds

Under this heading *The Commonwealth*, a Roman Catholic weekly, states: "Catholics in the State of Ohio have continued their efforts to obtain a measure of State aid for parochial grade and high schools. Some years ago an initial effort by the bishops met with a rebuff when some Protestants held that the principle of separation between Church and State was in danger. At the present moment two bills are pending before the Legislature. One provides that \$2.50 a year shall be allotted annually for every child in school. This measure has been recommended by the Senate Education Committee, though the final vote was 7 to 4. The chances that it will pass are therefore good, but considerable opposition must be expected. The second is the so-called Fair-Play Bill, which would create a fund of \$3,500,000 a year for two years, to be known as a Parent-Child Educational Fund. Various prominent Catholics have spoken for the bill, notably the Rev. R. C. Goebel of Mansfield. Sterner opposition is expected to this measure, although the outlook, as we write, is not by any means dark. According to the text the State director of education, having ascertained the number of children in attendance at school, shall administer funds appropriated out of 'general revenue' for the purpose of aiding parents who have elected 'to fulfil the duty of preparing their children for citizenship in schools not supported by State funds.' The parents are to receive for each child 'an amount equal to \$.10 per day for the pupils in such elementary schools and \$.15 per day for the pupils in such high schools, based on the actual daily attendance in such schools for the preceding year.' This would mean \$18 a year for the average child. Since there is an estimated total of 300,000 Catholic children in Ohio parish-schools, the total sum of \$3,500,000 seems very moderate. It is not believed that a suggestion of this character has been advanced previously, and the fate of the measure will be awaited with general interest."

Theological Observer — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches

I. Amerika

The U. L. C. Crusade against Verbal Inspiration.—The *Lutheran* is fighting the plenary inspiration and infallibility of Scripture in season and out of season. The issue of Jan. 14 carries an article by Dr. H. C. Alleman of Gettysburg, reporting on the seventeenth annual meeting of the Advisory Council of the American Bible Society, which contains these paragraphs:—

"The devotional address was made by President W. Richards, who represented the Evangelical and Reformed Church. Dr. Richards' theme was The Place of the Bible in the Missionary Enterprise, and he wove his thought into answers of two questions, 'What is the Bible?' and 'What is the Bible for?' *The Bible is not a sacred oracle speaking infallibly in every book on everything that is contained in it; yet it is infallible when it speaks of the object of our faith and the way of life. What is infallible in the Bible? The good news, or the Gospel of God, which God revealed in the prophets and fulfilled in the Christ. One misses the mark when he turns to the Bible for science, history, literature, or philosophy. It was not the intention of God or of His prophets, of the Christ or of the apostles, to teach men what they can discover. . . . The Bible does not contain even a system of theology or of ethics. In it there is something far greater, which furnishes the material for theology and ethics, namely, the Gospel of God.*

"The Bible contains many forms of literature. One form belongs to the Bible alone and is not found in the sacred books of the East, and that is the gospels. For the Bible alone contains the Gospel, the good news that God is Love and that His purpose in giving love and that His purpose in giving us His Word is the realization in time and in eternity of an order of life among men of every tribe and nation in whom the Spirit of Jesus prevails. This good news comes to men individually; but God does not call men to solitude, but always into society. Yet no man can serve God in society unless he personally responds to God's call to service. The social message of the Gospel is as much a part of God's plan as the personal message. The Gospel in the Bible must daily be revealed in men and women and be approved by faith working in love; for it cannot be proved by logic or by mathematical demonstration. The whole Bible is not Gospel, but the whole Gospel runs in higher or lower tones through the whole Bible. We must do what *Luther* said in a homely, but penetrating sentence: '*The pure Scriptures must be separated from their dregs and filth, which it has ever been my aim to do, that the divine truths may be looked upon in one light and trifles of men in another.*'"

So far the quotation from Dr. Alleman's article. We might say in passing that we all are agreed that "the Bible alone contains the Gospel"; also, "that the whole Bible is not Gospel." Furthermore, it is commendable that the author of this article tells us plainly where

he stands: "The Bible is not a sacred oracle, speaking infallibly in every book on everything that is contained in it." But what we are particularly interested in at the present time is the reference to Luther. "We must do what Luther said in a homely, but penetrating sentence: 'The pure Scriptures must be separated from their dregs and filth, which it has ever been my aim to do, that the divine truths may be looked upon in one light and trifles of men in another.'" This quotation is supposed to prove that Luther took a "liberal" attitude towards Scripture, that he did not believe that everything in the Bible is inspired and infallible. The list containing similar quotations from Luther, garbled or misinterpreted statements, such as the familiar "was Christum treibt" (Luther, XIV, 129) and "schlechte und geringe Windeln" (XIV, 4), has been thoroughly examined in Dr. Pieper's *Christliche Dogmatik*, I, p. 346 ff.; see also *CONC. TH. MONTHLY.*, 1930, p. 868 ff.; 1932, p. 306 ff.; 1936, p. 166. The statement adduced in our article is not so familiar. Let us examine it. Unfortunately Dr. Alleman fails to give its location in Luther's works. That is most unfair. It is possible that the source on which he depended failed in the same respect. Still he should not have published this matter until he had verified it. The context in which this quotation appears in the article makes Luther say that parts of Scripture are pure and other parts filthy, that the careful reader of the Bible must be careful to distinguish between the trifles with which Scripture deals and the important things, because the Bible is made up of infallible truth and fallible statements of men. *Luther never said that!* If you find the context of the above quotation in Luther, you will find that here again Luther has been misinterpreted.

We are now in for an exploration of Luther's works. We may not find the utterance in question at once, but we are sure to profit by the search. Let us begin with Volume I. Gen. 24, 22 tells of the earring and bracelets given to Rebekah, and Luther comments (p. 1711, St. Louis ed.): "What is here related is adjudged by reason to be a most carnal and worldly affair; and I myself often wonder why Moses expends so many words on such trifling things, since he was so brief on much more important things. But I do not doubt that the *Holy Ghost* wanted these things to be written down for our instruction. For nothing is presented to us in Scripture that is trifling and useless; for *all that is written* was written for our learning, Rom. 15, 4." That does not sound as though Luther held that Scripture contained "trifles of men" which do not belong to the saving Word. Vol. II, on Gen. 29, 1-3 (Jacob meeting Rachel), p. 459 ff.: "Thus the holy fathers, I say, are depicted in a rude and carnal way, in the low estate of this life, than which in the mind of the papists there can be nothing more unclean and disreputable. They say that here nothing better is presented to us than that they took wives, begat children, milked the cows and goats, etc., which are altogether worldly and pagan works. . . . Thou must not think or wonder why the Holy Ghost delights in describing such paltry and contemptible things, but listen to what St. Paul says, Rom. 15, 4: 'Whatsoever things were written,' etc. If we firmly believed that *the Holy Ghost Himself*, and God, the Creator of all, is *the true*

Author of this book and of these paltry and contemptible things, as they seem mean and trivial to our flesh, we should find the greatest comfort therein, as St. Paul says. . . . He would glorify not only their knightly virtues, but also the filthy and mean works, and this description adorns them as with gold and gems." On Gen. 30, 2, p. 538: "This needs to be inculcated why the Holy Spirit, who certainly has a clean mouth, busies himself with these things, which the most holy father, the Pope, and his chaste monks and nuns shrink even from thinking of as things which to them are altogether filthy and carnal." Certainly this cannot be the quotation which Dr. Alleman has in mind. On Gen. 30, 14—16, p. 566 f.: "The Holy Ghost, who is the Author of this book delights to describe, *dass er also spielen und scherzen moege*, these trivial puerile things which are not of much use. We thus understand that it is not useless that the Holy Spirit bids us read, teach, and believe these things. . . . We should glory and rejoice in these common works of the household, since the Holy Spirit condescends to expatiate on them." Still not the quotation we are looking for! Perhaps we shall find it in those sections which record the sins of men, the real filth. On Gen. 38 (the revolting story of Judah and Tamar), p. 1167 f.: "Why did the *Holy Ghost* have these shameful and unspeakable things written down and preserved to be told and read in the Church? Who will believe that such things are profitable for edification and salvation? . . . These examples are set before us for instruction and comfort and for the strengthening of our faith; they show the great grace and mercy of God." Are these the dregs and filth that Luther would have us separate from the pure Scriptures? On v. 19, p. 1200: "Why does the most pure *mouth of the Holy Spirit* stoop down to such low, despicable things, aye, things which are unchaste and filthy, yea, damnable, as if such things should serve to instruct the Church and congregation of God? How does that concern the Church?" Read on for yourself and see why *the Holy Spirit* has put this filth into Scripture. On Gen. 38, 27—30, p. 1214: "Behold how carefully *the Holy Spirit* describes this miserable, piteous delivery!" In Vol. III, p. 559, on Gen. 38, we read: "It is true, this is a rather gross chapter. However, it is found in Holy Scripture, and *the Holy Spirit* wrote it, whose mouth and pen are as clean as ours. . . . If He was not ashamed to write it, we should not be ashamed to read and hear it." This, too, does not sound like Dr. Alleman's quotation.—For the present we shall have to give up the search. But men who so glibly quote Luther should, in all fairness, indicate volume and page. E.

A U. L. C. Theologian on the Real Presence.—The *Lutheran Church Quarterly* of October, 1936, publishes an article by Rev. H. L. Creager, entitled "Values Received through the Holy Communion." The concluding paragraphs read: "In conclusion I would offer a few thoughts on how these values are conveyed to us. This is frankly in the realm of theory; positiveness is impossible; I present an idea which I have found helpful and fairly satisfying. We believe, of course, that it is not the bread and wine that are directly efficacious, but it is the living presence of Christ in those physical elements. The important thing is to have

the faith to lay hold on that presence; the appealing power of the picture which Christ's words suggest is worth more than a logical explanation. But in trying to comprehend it, the following conception has helped me to grasp the blessed fact of that Real Presence.

"Jesus said the bread was His body. What is a body? The body of a person is both the abode in which the soul or real personality dwells and also the instrument which he uses in order to accomplish the purposes formed in his will. Now, Jesus chooses this bread to live in and work through; He chooses it as the instrument which He will use to bring His presence and His saving power to us. It expresses and accomplishes the saving purpose of delivering from sin and restoring to God, just as did the flesh in which He once lived. Therefore He properly calls it His body. Likewise the blood is the symbol and power of life. So Jesus chooses and uses this fruit of the vine to bring the power of His life into our lives; He conveys Himself and His living and healing and vitalizing power to all of us through it, just as the blood conveys the purifying and vitalizing oxygen to all parts of the body. Hence He properly calls the wine His blood, the medium of conveying spiritual life and sustenance to us. His Real Presence is truly in the Sacrament; and as we by faith receive it, we receive Him and the blessings of salvation and life eternal which He offers."

This is strange doctrine—to appear in a Lutheran publication. It would not appear strange in some Reformed publications. The so-called Real Presence in the Reformed theology is the presence of Christ with His blessings. And that is what the Real Presence of our article amounts to. But even Reformed theologians, of the regular type, would reject Pastor Creager's interpretation of the words "This is My body" as strange and monstrous. "Jesus chooses this bread to live in and work through; He chooses it as the instrument which He will use to bring His presence and saving power to us. *Therefore He properly calls it His body.*" "This is My body" does not mean the real body of the Lord. Jesus calls the bread His body because it is the instrument through which He works! And that interpretation is offered to the readers of the *Lutheran Church Quarterly*. Luther lists seven interpretations of the words "This is My body," current among the deniers of the Real Presence. The first was Carlstadt's: Christ, pointing to his body, said: "*Hie sitzt mein Leib.*" The fourth was Schwenkfeld's "My body is bread; *vernimm, eine geistliche Speise.*" The seventh was fathered by John Campanus: This bread is a body, a dead, lifeless body; but since it is My creature, it is My body, *den ich geschaffen habe.*" (You must read the entire section, Vol. XX, p. 1771 f.) Pastor Creager's interpretation resembles that of Campanus. But it also differs from it. Krauth informs us that "at the beginning of the seventeenth century there were *twenty-eight* contradictory views" current among the deniers of the Real Presence. (*Conservative Reformation*, p. 607.) Perhaps Pastor Creager's view is listed among these twenty-eight. But whatever its pedigree, it is a monstrous thing that the *Lutheran Church Quarterly* publishes this outright denial of the Real Presence without the slightest note of protest. The *Lutheran Church Quarterly* is pub-

lished by the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburg and the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Mount Airy, Philadelphia, and it disseminates views concerning which Luther said: "*Ihr habt einen andern Geist denn wir.*" *

Here are two important doctrines: the doctrine of the verbal inspiration of Scripture and the doctrine of the real presence of the body of the Lord in the Lord's Supper. They are publicly denied within the United Lutheran Church. And now there are men traveling up and down the land shouting: The things keeping the Lutheran synods apart are mere trivialities! It is not surprising when a liberal theologian like H. L. Willett speaks of trivialities in this connection. Answering a question "regarding the chief obstacles to Christian unity," he said in the *Christian Century* of January 27, 1937: "The controversies over the inspiration of the Scriptures . . . , creation or evolution . . . , the meaning of Baptism . . . , are ceasing to be counted worthy of causing divisions among the friends of Jesus. There is a growing sentiment that, if God is really concerned about matters of that nature, He is a trivial God." Dr. Willett is a liberal theologian. And here we have Lutherans, some of them of the clergy, who know, or ought to know, that the U. L. C. tolerates or even sanctions the denial of important teachings of Scripture and of the Lutheran Church and still insist (we shall quote the exact words): "Our petty divisions seem pitiful." "How small and mean and contemptible do our petty differences appear in the light of the great fundamental truths that were brought to light again in the Reformation!" "We have been misled to believe that our fine-spun definitions and our growing traditions are eternal and changeless." "I want to state emphatically that the real issue is not Missouri or the United Lutheran Church. That issue is a dead, meaningless issue of yesterday. . . . Basically we are suffering from the deadly disease of orthodoxy. . . . We have come to identify conservative Lutheranism with the dogmatic orthodoxy of Missouri at its worst." "Artificial, man-made barriers have been separating Lutherans in America." "Our minor differences are not fundamental moral and religious differences." "On essentials we are agreed. Why, then, can we not agree on, or forget, non-essentials? . . . When Lutherans forget their silly differences, then the Lutheran Church in America will grow as it never grew before." "The tragedy of this whole battle of words and logic." "The curse of superlogic." "Our divisions, our competition, our cross purposes, are unpardonable sin."—Do these men know what they are talking about? E.

* The *Lutheran*, published by the Board of Publication of the United Lutheran Church, is disseminating the same views. On February 11, 1937, it published a review of Emil Brunner's *Our Faith*, which states: "We even doubt that Lutherans will find fault with his chapter on the 'Lord's Supper'—'Not simply bread and wine, but Christ Himself is present in the Sacrament,' he affirms." Calvin had affirmed that long ago. When the Reformed speak of a "real presence," they do not mean the real presence of the body of Christ, but the presence of Christ with His benefits. Their phrase: "*Christ is present*" takes the place of Luther's statement: "It is the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, under the bread and wine." And Lutherans are not supposed to find fault with this phrase!

Discussion in the U. L. C. on the Status of Women in the Church.—

It will be recalled that at the 1936 convention of the U. L. C., when the question came before the meeting whether women might be sent as delegates to synod, the majority of the committee which had considered the matter recommended that synod should express itself to the effect that the election of women delegates to meetings of synods is not unscriptural. The convention adopted the committee's recommendation, although the vote was not unanimous. When the question arose whether the resolution of the convention was binding for the consciences of those who did not consider it Scriptural, the Commission of Adjudication was charged with the task of studying, and giving a reply to, this question. If we understand the *Lutheran* of February 4 correctly, the question for the Commission of Adjudication has been worded thus: "Is this action binding upon the consciences of one who cannot accept it as a correct action?" It is our hope that the commission in question will bring in a report which will clearly state both what Scripture teaches on the status of women in the Church and on the binding character of a resolution like the one under discussion.

A.

The Troubles of the Chiliastic Literalists.—The premillennialists declare that those who reject the doctrine of the millennium are out of harmony with Scripture, since the prophecies plainly state that the earthly kingdom of David will be reestablished, with his throne at Jerusalem. They insist that Scripture, understood in its literal, true sense, teaches that in the millennium Christ will rule this Davidic kingdom in visible glory. They charge the amillennialists, who hold that the prophecies foretell a spiritual kingdom of the Son of David, with apostasy from Scripture. In his book *Premillennialism or Amillennialism?* C. Feinberg, a premillennialist of the antitribulationist school, postponentment-theory section, stresses this point again and again. "According to the angel's words Mary literally brought forth a son; His name was literally called Jesus; He was literally great; and He was literally called the Son of the Highest. Will it not be as literally fulfilled that God will yet give to Christ the throne of His father David, that He will reign over the house of Jacob forever, and that of His glorious kingdom there shall be no end?" (P. 39.) See Luke 1, 32 f.; 2 Sam. 7, 16; Ps. 132. "Our aim shall be to show the consistency of the premillennial position as it is based on the literal sense of the Scriptures and to demonstrate that by that method, and that alone, can the entire Word of God be brought into harmony." (P. 52.) "Another purpose of the age is to fulfil God's oath and promise to David. God declared time and again that He would not lie to David. The millennial reign proves that He did not lie to him. . . . If God promises Israel a literal kingdom and then gives the world a spiritualized kingdom in this age, what becomes of the promises of God?" (P. 147.) "If the posterity of David in their present dispersion, with the kingdom of the house of David gone and the throne done away with and displaced by a spiritual kingdom, over which Christ rules from the throne where He is now seated, can be reasonably taken as a fulfilment of God's covenant with David, then words have indeed lost their meaning, and the Bible must be for us from henceforth an insoluble

riddle." (P.197.) "Amos predicted that God would raise up the tabernacle of David and 'build it as in the days of old.' In the days of old, if the Scriptures mean what they say, the tabernacle of David *was on earth*." (P.211.) And what sort of a kingdom does Scripture, taken in its literal, true sense, promise Israel? "Christ will come to reign over the Jewish nation for a thousand years." (P.213.) "Nature will be rejuvenated, and harmony will once more reign. The curse will be removed from the ground, and the desert and wilderness will be abundantly fruitful and productive. Animal creation also will experience a change, in which animals of rapacious appetites will become meek and tame. The age of man will be lengthened; for a man of one hundred years will be esteemed but a child. No longer will there be a division in the midst of Israel, but Israel and Judah will be united and will dwell together in their own land of blessing. The coming of the King to the Mount of Olives will bring about physical changes in the land that will alter its contour. The city of Jerusalem will be built again, adorned, and be fruitful as never before. The nations in the Kingdom will recognize the favored condition of Israel when God wipes away forever their reproach and uses them in the conversion of the Gentiles. The land will be redistributed among the twelve tribes, and the Temple will be rebuilt, with the sacrifices, as memorials, reinstituted. Israel will also rule over the nations under the direct command of the King. All nations will dwell in obedience and submission to their righteous King." (P.146.)

The chief trouble with the chiliastic exegetics is that Scripture itself rejects the literalistic interpretation of the prophecies. Scripture itself plainly teaches that the kingdom promised to David and Israel is a spiritual kingdom and that these prophecies have their fulfilment in the Church, in the spiritual reign of Christ. See Acts 2, 16 ff.; 15, 14 ff.; Heb. 12, 22. We shall not discuss this matter in detail here; it is familiar to the readers of Dr. Pieper's *Christliche Dogmatik*; see III, 585 ff. Clinging to the *sensus literae*, the premillennialist departs from the *sensus literalis*, the literal sense being the sense intended.

But there are other troubles involving those who insist that the *sensus literae* is the true, intended, literal sense, and we propose to take that up at the present time because Professor Feinberg himself calls attention to it. He writes: "Amillennialists accuse the premillennialists of taking prophecy in its literal sense and yet shortening the eternal kingdom of Christ to a mere thousand years. We shall deal with this question more fully later." (P.59.) That certainly presents quite a difficulty. According to these literalists the kingdom promised Israel is an earthly kingdom, with its seat of government at Jerusalem, in Palestine, possessed by the Jewish nation, and it shall endure for one thousand years. There is no getting around the fact that the prophecy (in Revelation) distinctly and repeatedly mentions "a thousand years." However, 2 Sam. 7, 16 distinctly says: "Thy kingdom shall be established forever," and Luke 1, 33: "Of His kingdom there shall be no end." But "one thousand years" and eternity are not equivalents, and an *earthly* kingdom cannot be an eternal kingdom. Nevertheless, the premillennialist insists that the prophecies have their fulfilment in the millennium. What is the solution of the difficulty? Professor Feinberg promised to

"deal with this question more fully later." But we have been unable to find the page—or pages—where it is discussed. However, from hints found here and there we know what his solution is. On page 147 he states that "the millennium is followed by the new heavens and the new earth." And what place the "new earth" occupies in dispensational theology, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, of which Professor Feinberg is a coeditor, fully discloses. We are told, in the issue of October-December, 1936, that "the national entity of Israel will be preserved forever according to covenant promises"; that "Judaism has its eschatology reaching on into eternity with covenants and promises which are everlasting," while "Christianity has its eschatology which is different at every point"; that "the kingdom of heaven is always earthly"; that "one of the great burdens of predictive prophecy is the anticipation of the glories of Israel in a transformed earth under the reign of David's Son and that there is likewise much prediction which anticipates the glories of the redeemed in heaven"; that "there is a present distinction between earth and heaven which is preserved even after both are made new," and that "the Scriptures so designate an earthly people who go on as such into eternity." *Bibliotheca Sacra* of 1934 states on page 147 that "Israelites, as a nation, have their citizenship now and their future destiny centered only in the earth, reaching on to the new earth, which is yet to be, while Christians have their citizenship and future destination centered only in heaven, extending on into the new heavens that are yet to be." So the difficulty is solved. The thousand years extend into eternity. The earthly kingdom of David promised to the Jews will display its power and glory here on earth for a thousand years and eternally in another earth, the new earth. Feinberg, *op. cit.*, p. 238: "Christ will reign a thousand years over the earth with His saints in the covenanted kingdom of David," and p. 245: "He will be rightful King on the throne of His father David and will rule over the house of Jacob forever." So this trouble is ended—but only to beget new troubles. Scripture does indeed tell of "new heavens and a new earth" (see, for instance, Is. 65, 17 and Rev. 21, 1); but what law of chiliastic hermeneutics permits the dispensationalists to populate the "new earth" with Israelites, the "new heaven," however, with Christians? ("New heavens and a new earth" designates the glories of heaven. See CONC. THEOL. MTHLY., 1934, p. 29 ff.) Again, "earthly" and "eternal" are contradictories; but the dispensationalist is required to think of the earthly kingdom of heaven as remaining earthly and still being eternal; "an earthly people who go on as such into eternity."

The dispensationalist gets into trouble in another respect. He finds himself relinquishing the *sensus literae* quite frequently. We find the statement on page 62: "The Forty-fifth Psalm depicts the marriage of the King." Here the chiliast finds himself unable to think of anything else than a spiritual marriage, just as he refuses, on this same page, to take the statement concerning the garments of the King smelling of myrrh, aloes, and cassia "literally." He declares that that is spoken "in Oriental fashion."—There is the prophecy Joel 3, 18: "The mountains shall drop down new wine." Dr. Pieper points out that the chiliasts here insist on the figurative interpretation. (*Chr. Dog.*, III, p. 587.)—Professor Fein-

berg on Ezek. 34: "Then will He set up a shepherd who will care for His sheep, even His servant David. Showers of blessing will make the land productive. The blessings of God that will attend the visible kingdom of the King of the lineage and house of David are further set before us in the thirty-sixth chapter." (P. 72.) The prophecy reads: "I will set up one shepherd over them, *even My servant David*," v. 23. Thinking literally, we find here the promise that God will raise up His servant David from the dead to rule in the millennium. Our dispensationalist cannot do that. He sees the prophecy pointing to a king of the house of David. He is not true to his principle of interpretation. We are not, of course, finding fault with the premillennialists for departing from the *sensus literae* in the matter of the marriage of the King and of the abundance of new wine and of "My servant David." But we tell them that they are getting in trouble with themselves when they insist that, if we do not take certain expressions literally, "then words have indeed lost their meaning, and the Bible must be for us from henceforth an insoluble riddle." Careful!

Finally, the dispensationalist is going to have a lot of trouble to get us to agree with his interpretation of the Book of Jonah. This matter will also serve to exemplify to what lengths a mind obsessed with a delusion will go in manipulating Scripture in order to find some confirmation of his error. We read on page 79: "When we turn to the prophet Jonah, we find no definite and explicit prophecy of the covenanted kingdom of David." That is certainly true. According to the literal sense we have here a story that deals with *Jonah and Nineveh*, with the perversity of Jonah and the wickedness of Nineveh, and with the patience and all-embracing mercy of God. But now the dispensationalist, who has been upbraiding us for departing from the *sensus literae*, frankly and unblushingly—for no reason whatever except to find support for his pet delusion—finds the chief importance of the book not in the literal story, but in what it allegedly *typifies*. Forget what it literally tells and find a figurative, typical interpretation! "Many are agreed that the sole purpose of the message is not to show the bigotry of the prophet or even how God accepts true repentance. Nor is the only purpose of the book to reveal that God is the God of all nations. The message of Jonah typifies in a most remarkable manner the whole life history of the nation of Israel. She will yet be gathered out of her captivity into her own land, where she will preach God's message to the nations in the kingdom, as confirmed by Isaiah and others. Jonah, then, is a typical book, demonstrating Israel's fulfilling her God-given and long-rejected mission in the age of the kingdom." The dispensationalist will have trouble to make the common Christian believe that.

E.

A New Sect.—It has been discovered by the author of the article "India's Seething Untouchables," published in the *Christian Century* of January 13, 1937. P. Oommen Philip (a native Hindu?) writes: "Effect of Christian Divisions. The divisions of the Christian Church with its competing denominations and mutually anathematizing sects are also much in evidence in India. The awakened depressed classes are not

a little confused by the extraordinary claim made by the Roman Catholic Church that it alone is the true Church, and by the counter-claims made by modern sects like Missouri (!) Lutherans, Seventh-day Adventists and Pentecostal Christians that they are the custodians of true Christianity." We wonder whether Editor Morrison recognized the sect "Missourie" which Contributor Philip mentions or whether he thought that "Missourie" is derived from the Hindustani.

The reason why we are preserving this choice item by finding space for it in our MONTHLY is not so much because it illustrates the inability of many to distinguish between the claims of the Roman Catholics and of the Lutherans (there is a difference between saying that a Church is the alone-saving Church and that a Church is the true visible Church), but because it brings to our attention one of the favorite arguments of the unionist. The article is citing the case of "the Christian divisions" as "one of the important considerations which make it difficult for many among the depressed classes to look with favor on Christianity." The unionist likes to argue that, since the heathen and the churchless are confused and scandalized by the divisions obtaining in the Church, it is incumbent on the Christians to forget their differences and form one united Church, even though the differences continue. The premise is correct: People are confused by these divisions; it is a scandal and a crime that Christianity does not form one united visible Church. But the inference is false. The scandal cannot be removed by indifference towards the false teaching which has split the Church. The Christian way is to remove the false teaching. The "confusion" resulting from the divisions in the Church must not be charged to the defenders of the truth, but to the originators and defenders of heresies.

P. Oommen Philip explains in the *Christian Century* of April 21 that he "meant the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri" (which of course we knew), and then goes on to describe quite correctly (for which we thank him) Missouri as the uncompromising foe of unionism. "It is a matter for disappointment to all who have at heart the cause of interdenominational cooperation that this mission in India does not see its way to have, or encourage its converts to have, fellowship with Christians of other denominations. The 'Missouri Lutherans,' as they are briefly known here, do not have fellowship or cooperation even with other Lutheran missions from America and the continent of Europe which are at work in India. This mission and the Church associated with it are not yet constituent bodies of the Federation of Ev. Lutheran Churches in India which was established in 1926."

E.

Speaking of unionism (of which the promiscuous exchange of pulpits, "pulpit-fellowship," is an outstanding feature), we submit the following pertinent paragraphs from an article appearing in the *Living Church* (Jan. 16, 1937). The matter is familiar to us, but it is well to know that others view it in the same light as we do. The principle stressed in the *Living Church* article is the correct one.

"Suburban and metropolitan churches have widely advertised Congregational, Presbyterian, and Methodist preachers at church services. The bishops seem to ignore the situation. The people apparently love to have it so. It seems so delightfully broad-minded. This growing

abuse is defended, not by reason, but by the raising of false issues or the old device of 'red herrings.' The invited Protestants are good preachers; isn't it better to have a first-class Methodist preach to us than a third-rate curate or perhaps a seminarian? Furthermore, they are godly men and have a message; should our people be denied the opportunity of hearing such a message? And the exchange of pulpits will hasten the day of reunited Christendom. . . .

"The herrings are all good, but they don't lead anywhere. Let us take a specific example. The late Dr. S. Parkes Cadman was advertised to preach in Grace Church, New York, last Lent. Dr. Cadman was a fine preacher, a noted orator, a leader of men, a man of unquestionably upright life, and one who had a message for the world of today. Quite seriously I say that I yield to no one in my personal admiration for him, which is the only reason why I select him as an illustration. But if the function of preaching is what the Church has always believed and what our Prayer-book sets forth, and if the solemn vows of our ordination are anything more than empty forms, then I respectfully submit that Dr. Cadman, with all of his unquestionable ability, was not only less qualified than a licensed seminarian to preach at Grace Church, but *he was absolutely and entirely disqualified. If he could 'so minister the doctrine of Christ as this Church hath received the same' with a good conscience, it would seem inconsistent for him to remain, as he was, a minister of a Church with quite different standards.*" [Italics ours.] It was always worth while what he said. But the pulpit of the Episcopal Church is not the place for it. The people have a right to hear from the pulpit only the teachings of the Church, not the opinions of any man, clever and good as he may be.

"Of course, the exchange of pulpits will further unity among Christians if unity is to be attained by forgetting our differences. . . ." E.

In Spiritual Unity with Our Fathers of Faith.—Said a St. Louis preacher the other day: "Numerous other factors make it necessary for the minister to equip himself more fully. Because of a wider dissemination of education the minister must read constantly, widely, and critically. He must add travel to study and numerous contacts with real life to personal philosophy of life and thoughtful devotion to God. . . ." Yes, yes, we have more high-school students and college graduates in our congregations than formerly, and we must address ourselves to their needs. But in ministering to them, we must not forget that there are also those among our hearers who, as Dr. Adolf Hult of Augustana Seminary puts it, though "uneducated and unschooled," are powerfully "at home" in the Word, in Luther, and in the other Lutheran fathers, and we must know how to reach *them*, too. And it will benefit the high-school graduates, too, if they hear quite a bit of the theology of Luther and Walther and Stoeckhardt. By all means study modern philosophy; you need it. But above all study Luther and Pieper—that you need a thousand times more. And if we do not have many who are "at home" in Luther and Scriver and the other fathers, let us educate our college graduates up to that standard. This is what Dr. Hult wrote on this matter in the *Lutheran Companion* of February 25:—

"In spiritual unity with our fathers of faith our personal life and

corporate Christ-faith and life progress more soundly, definitely, and with richer helpfulness to other seeking souls. Are we growing thinner of content? Must we therefore strike out for novelties, for passing stimulatives, for quirks and conceits of interest, for 'fillers'? What profound regard a pastor formerly could have for one of these 'uneducated' and 'unschooled' lay folk who were powerfully 'at home' in the Word, in Luther, in Arndt, in Scriver, in Schartau, in Rosenius, in the deepest and richest fathers of Lutheran doctrine and Lutheran faith-life! I could relate much more on that point, even from my own home. Particularly does the vagrant churchism of our day require that type of preachers, facing the contemporary situation and needs with the immense stores of wealth and of spiritual experience our Church can offer. This is factitively decreasing. *Hence even the pulpit shows thinness there.* Modern we must be. Know our times—that is indisputable. Live for souls of today, certainly. Preach to our time: Luther did so; all the great spiritual heroes did. We must also. But all those fathers we know of had a cornucopia of spiritual insight, faith, life, experience, and power of expression to draw from. Have we? *Is our very language worn and every-dayish* and unable to draw water from the deep wells, to give it whether to aged men and women of mature faith or to children and seeking youth? Twenty-one years at the seminary brings me to wonder why we cannot increase in spiritual enrichment to the degree our fathers knew. We know administrative affairs somewhat better. We have more worldly tact. We can address us in the newspaperish idiom in facile manner. Oh, that we had more kinship with our fathers of great faith and *their wondrously expressive spirituality!* That can return. That can be gained if at the cost of as keen meditation and of as humble sense of cross and suffering as they. The price is worth the outlay. And oh, the cheer and the godly furtherance it brings!—These lines are given to any one, lay or clerical, who cares to think of a most significant spiritual concern."

E.

The Give-and-Take Plan of Union.—The men getting ready for the unionistic venture of the World Conference on Faith and Order, to meet at Edinburgh next August, are told by a writer in the *Christian Century* of February 10 that, unless they adopt this plan, their enterprise will be abortive. "In this spirit of give and take we should go to Edinburgh." The Lutherans are particularly asked to take notice: "The Lutherans should be paged and told about it." This is the plan: "These communions must share their spiritual possessions by a process of exchange, each contributing something to others and gaining something which it did not bring and each perhaps discarding something altogether as outmoded or outgrown." If that is not done, "Edinburgh will be a failure." All right, what doctrine or practise should the Lutherans discard? You will be surprised. If we went to Edinburgh under this plan, we would offer as our contribution the doctrine of justification by faith alone. That is our most cherished spiritual possession, and we would like to have all share in it. But our author says: "In the spirit of give and take we should go to Edinburgh. The Anglicans should bring with them their doctrine of an apostolic succession, which seems to those who do

not hold it to be so full of assumptions, historical and theological, and they should be prepared to demonstrate its truth to their Christian brethren. Lutherans might bring their doctrine of justification by faith, which, as often formulated, conceals a subtle assumption, not so much in what it affirms as in what it implicitly denies." We are certainly glad to note that this writer is inclined to call the doctrine of justification by faith the distinctive Lutheran doctrine. But it seems that, when the Lutherans appear at Edinburgh, — the United Lutheran Church of America is sending a delegation, — the proponent of the give-and-take plan is going to call upon them to discard it and "take" something better. He will not have it put in the "give" column. Just what is wrong with it he does not state.

The Episcopalians will be called upon "to demonstrate the truth of their doctrine of an apostolic succession to their Christian brethren." The Lutherans, of course, will be expected to do the same with regard to their doctrine of justification by faith. What will happen if the Lutherans cannot convince the rest that what this doctrine "implicitly denies" is also denied by *Scripture*? Will the matter be settled by a majority vote?

Things must not be allowed to reach that pass. Under the "give-and-take" method this difficulty will not arise. This method presupposes that the delegates will not take their stand on *Scripture*. And it is the purpose of the article under discussion to wean the delegates from the mistaken notion that *Scripture* is the final authority. "The motto of the Disciples of Christ, 'Where the Scriptures speak, we speak; where they are silent, we are silent' cannot be recognized as binding." Doctrines must not be based on *Scripture* alone. "Has the accumulated experience of the centuries no authority? Has Christian tradition no weight? Did God cease to speak to men when the New Testament canon was closed?" The article then goes on to demonstrate that *Scripture* cannot settle matters of doctrine by employing the old argument: "Using the proof-text method, which Baptists themselves employ, each denomination could draw a very respectable argument for its contentions from the New Testament. . . . Surely all these differing interpretations cannot be right." And then comes the astounding statement: "Perhaps all can be right even though they differ. 'In the New Testament,' says Prof. Wilhelm Hermann in *Communion with God*, 'there is no unalterable doctrine which embraces the whole scheme of Christian thought. . . . It is no imperfection, it is rather an excellence, and thoroughly as it should be, that the epistles of the New Testament are messages for definite circumstances and not contributions to a doctrinal system which shall be valid to all eternity.' This, if true, is important, and the Lutherans should be paged and told about it." The "give-and-take" plan will not work if the Lutherans keep on believing and insisting that their doctrine, based on *Scripture*, is unalterable. It will work only if people get imbued with the spirit of uncertainty. When people are no longer persuaded of the truth of *Scripture* and hold that there is no absolute truth, they will be ready to engage in doctrinal dickerings. And therein lies the strength of unionism, the mighty appeal of the "give-and-take" plan of union; in doctrinal incertitude and indifference.

The "give-and-take" plan does not appeal to Karl Barth. He is in favor of a different brand of unionism, which is just as monstrous as the "give-and-take" plan. In his lecture *The Church and the Churches*, which the secretariate of the World Conference incorporated in the pamphlet *World Conference on Faith and Order — Prolegomena to the 1937 World Conference*, he says on page 36: "Within the multiplicity each Church can represent the unity of the Church if in its ordinances it is zealous for Christ. Each several Church should ask itself the same question with regard to the central problem of doctrine. It may sound like perilous relativism; yet of this problem also I will say the same thing — let the Roman Church work out its doctrine of nature and grace, with the Tridentine teaching on justification, to their logical conclusions; let the Lutheran and Calvinistic bodies do the same with their specific eucharistic doctrine and neo-Protestantism with its doctrine of man's natural goodness; but let them do this not merely in a syllogistic spirit nor as working with logical fervor on the basis of presuppositions which stop short of being ultimate, but as listening to Christ, to Christ of the Scriptures. . . . Those who fail to understand other churches than their own are not the people who care intensely about theology, but the theological dilettants, eclectics, and historians of all sorts; while those very men who have found themselves forced to confront a clear thoroughgoing, logical *sic et non* find themselves allied to each other, in spite of all contradictions, by an underlying fellowship and understanding, even in the cause which they handle so differently and approach from such painfully different angles. But that cause, it may be, is nothing else than Jesus Christ and the unity of the Church." This is the opposite of the "give-and-take" plan. The Barthian plan does not ask the churches to discard any of their doctrines. It permits the Roman Church to retain its doctrine of justification by works; the Lutheran Church its doctrine of the Real Presence, the Calvinistic bodies the doctrine of the Spiritual Presence. All that is required under the Barthian plan is that the churches persuade themselves that these different teachings do not destroy the unity of the Church. They need only persuade themselves that they are obeying the Spirit of Christ in espousing their particular teachings, and they will "find themselves allied to each other, in spite of all contradictions, by an underlying fellowship and understanding." This is, of course, not a specific discovery of Barth. It is the old contention of unionism. The unionists have insisted from the beginning that the differences of doctrine should not divide the churches, that each Church is entitled to maintain its own peculiar development, that all should practise Christian forbearance, that no Church should charge any other Church with false teaching. — The Barthian plan and the "give-and-take" plan differ in detail, but agree in the fundamental principle that there is no fixed, unalterable doctrine given the Church to maintain. "Perhaps all can be right, even though they differ," says the *Christian Century*. And Barth declares that the Catholics and Lutherans and Calvinists should maintain their differing doctrines "as listening to Christ, to Christ of the Scriptures." Scripture sanctions any doctrine, no doctrine. Unionism, in all its forms, stands for doctrinal incertitude. E.

"Rethinking Religion."—That is the title of a recent popular book by A. E. Avey, professor of philosophy in the Ohio State University, a condensation of which is offered in the *Religious Digest*. In a way, it is a modernistic dogmatics, since here the dogmas of Liberalism are presented in a somewhat systematic and definite form. And how does a modernistic dogmatist treat his *loci*? A few examples may help the reader in understanding how altogether negative modernistic philosophy is.

1. *Religion*. It is the effort of a man to adjust himself to Ultimate Reality.
2. *The Purpose of Modernistic Theology*. The purpose is to arrive at a useful restatement of the fundamental religious ideas which are eternal and which at the same time will be a new embodiment, harmonious with the esthetic and scientific progress of the age.
3. *The Preservation of Religion*. The only way of surely preserving the vitality of religion is to translate it from the obscurity of antiquity to the clarity of current experience.
4. *The Central Thought in Religion*. The focal appeal of religion is *incarnation*, the fascinating union of the Infinite with the finite.
5. *Religious Living*. Religious living means to express in human conduct the divine spirit.
6. *The Apprehension of the Truth*. The only aspect of truth which for us is absolute are the general principles of thinking, and only that religion which answers perfectly the tests of evidence and analysis can be recognized as valid. Inevitable contradiction occurs when Buddhist, Hindu, Ishmaelite, and Christian each avers that his particular scripture is the exclusive revelation of ultimate truth.
7. *The Existence of Evil*. A personal devil is actually the negation of personality; being evil is therefore no person at all, but an evil tendency. (What erudite reasoning!)
8. *God*. God being in some degree manifest everywhere, all things participate in His incarnation in reality. We may agree that Jesus was God incarnate, but we disagree that God was incarnate alone in Jesus.
9. *Immortality*. From the standpoint of human aspiration there is nothing religious in the concept of immortality; for immortality has a legitimate place in religion only in so far as the immortal being is of some interest to God.
10. *Salvation*. The important thing in salvation is not certain formalistic processes, but rather moral excellence of character. Individuals of greater moral influence have a higher degree of salvation than those of lesser influence. The rationality of the ethical religion dooms the special revelation and the arbitrary imposition of standards of righteousness and sin.
11. *Heaven*. Heaven is a place of vigor and activity in the persistent advance in the single direction of eternal values.
12. *The Church*. The Church in all its aspects exists for the constant perfecting of human life, and one of the chief means of doing so is by the adoption of an educational program for adults.
13. *The Church's Method of Saving Souls*. Salvation of souls is the ultimate function of the Church, which, by directing its members to unselfish and moral living, by instructing them in the tasks of parenthood, citizenship, social living, etc., cultivates people's intellects and stabilizes their emotions.
14. *The Task of the Church*. A great task of the Church is the synthesis of the great world religions into a brotherhood of the spirit of Christ, no matter what external form it assumes, just so it contributes to the ideal unity of those who have gained a true insight into the nature of religion.

15. *Human Responsibility.* The inexorable law of heredity seems to absolve man from responsibility; but if he is absolved, human life holds no moral significance whatever. The tendency of modern thought is toward immanent monism, which then would identify even the impulse of the universe with the thought of man and, *vice versa*, a perfect harmony of thought and action. 16. *Prayer.* Prayer is a psychological process of pragmatic and symbolic value. The essential thing is the suppliant attitude toward its object. 17. *The Religion of the Future.* The religion of the future will be syncretistic or synthetic. The justification for missionary endeavor lies in the view that all men seek the same good from their existence, but some have attained a clearer vision of what this good is and have gone farther along the way. The attitude of generous appreciation of the insight of non-Christian religions is no violation of the spirit of Christ; it is rather one of the most wholesome possible expressions of it. — But why write more? Every new statement quoted only shows the more clearly how shallow and empty Modernism is and that it offers in its soaring, high-sounding expressions nothing but the vaguest teachings of naturalism. The house that Modernism builds is nothing but a miserable shack, and at that, one built on quicksand. And yet, just that is the "religion" and "theology" which men like Rockefeller, Jones, and others are advocating for their "united Christian Church."

J. T. M.

II. Ausland

Die „missourische“ Lehre vom Antichristen. — „Erst den Missouriern war es im 19. Jahrhundert vorbehalten, das Dogma von dem Antichristentum des Papstes aufzustellen.“ Das schreibt Pfarrer Karl Rönne in der „Allg. Ev.-Luth. Rz.“ Der VII. Artikel in der Serie, „Bemühungen um eine lutherische Kirchenverfassung“, der, nebenbei gesagt, auch von dem „iure divino“ bezugten, symbolisch festgestellten Episkopat der lutherischen Kirche“ redet, schließt (S. 1018, 23. Okt. 1936) mit dem Passus: „Mit Recht erklärt darum Stahl: Nirgends haben auch die evangelischen Bekenntnisschriften diese Stellung zur katholischen Kirche als einen Glaubensartikel aufgestellt. Die Bezeichnung des Papstes als Antichrist in den Schmalkaldischen Artikeln ist nur eine beiläufige. In ihren Privatschriften haben die Reformatoren allerdings solche Benennungen wie Antichrist, babylonische Hure häufig gebraucht. Aber das erklärt sich aus der Hitze des Kampfes in jener Zeit und noch mehr daraus, daß sie nur die Sünde innerhalb der Kirche vor sich hatten und keine Anschauung von der Sünde außerhalb und wider die Kirche. Wie ganz anders würden sie sich gestellt haben, hätten sie die Mächte des Abgrundes gekannt, welche wir in unsern Tagen aus der Tiefe emporsteigen sahen.“ (Ev. Kirchenzeitung, 1852.) Erst den Missouriern war es im 19. Jahrhundert vorbehalten, das Dogma von dem Antichristentum des Papstes aufzustellen. (Gust. Frank, Gesch. der Prot. Theologie, Viertes Teil. Vgl. auch die Dogmatik von Pieper.)“

Bitte, die Missourier haben nicht die Lehre aufgebracht, daß der Papst der Antichrist ist. Die lutherische Kirche hat diese Lehre öffentlich bekannt, lange ehe es Missourier gab. Die Schmalkaldischen Artikel lehren, „*papam esse ipsum verum antichristum*“. (Trigl., S. 474.) Die Äußerung Stahls und Pfarrer Rönnes, diese Bezeichnung sei „nur eine beiläufige“, hält nicht

Stich. Diese Bezeichnung kehrt zu oft wieder, wird zu nachdrücklich ausgesprochen und zu deutlich als die Lehre der Schrift bezeichnet, als daß die Meinung aufkommen könnte, die Väter hätten hier nicht eine Lehre bekennen wollen. Der entschiedene Ausspruch auf S. 474: „Sowenig wir den Teufel selbst für einen Herrn oder Gott anbeten können, so wenig können wir auch seinen Apostel, den Papst oder Endchrist, in seinem Regiment zum Haupt oder Herrn leiden“ ist keine „nur beiläufige“ Bemerkung. Der ganze Artikel, IV, ist doch nicht nur so nebenbei in das Bekenntnis gekommen. Die Aussage auf S. 514: „So reimen sich auch alle Untugenden, so in der Heiligen Schrift vom Antichrist sind geweissagt, mit des Papstes Reich und seinen Gliedern usw.“ ist eine wohlüberlegte und ernstgemeinte. S. 516: „Alle Christen sollen vom Papst und seinen Gliedern oder Anhang als von des Antichrists Reich weichen und es verfluchen.“ Das soll nur so beiläufig gesagt sein? S. 520: „Man soll sich aus Not wider ihn als den rechten Antichrist setzen.“ Wieder die beiläufige Bezeichnung. Man muß das eben nicht so ernst nehmen, sagt Stahl. Im II. Artikel des zweiten Teils findet sich diese beiläufige Aussage: „*Invocatio sanctorum est etiam pars abusuum et errorum antichristi.*“ (S. 468.) Hier gibt sich das Bekenntnis nicht einmal die Mühe, ausdrücklich zu sagen, daß Antichrist eine Bezeichnung des Papstes ist. Und nun gebraucht gar die Konfessionsformel zweimal so ganz beiläufig die beiläufige Bezeichnung der Schmalkaldischen Artikel: „seinen Apostel, den Papst oder Antichrist“. (S. 1058.) „Alle Christen sollen vom Papst und seinen Gliedern oder Anhang als von des Antichrists Reich weichen.“ In der Bezeichnung „Antichrist“ liegt ja gerade die Begründung der Warnung. Und Begründungen pflegt man nicht nur so beiläufig anzubringen.

Nein, für diese Lehre darf man nicht die Missourier verantwortlich machen. Sie ist ja nicht einmal eine Sonderlehre der lutherischen Kirche. Die reformierten Kirchen haben dieselbe Lehre bekannt. So heißt es z. B. in dem Westminster-Bekenntnis der Presbyterianer, chapter XXV: „Nor can the Pope of Rome in any sense be head thereof [of the Church], but is that Antichrist, that man of sin and son of perdition that exalteth himself in the Church against Christ and all that is called God, Matt. 23, 8—10; 2 Thess. 2, 3 ff.“ Allerdings haben die Neu-Presbyterianer 1903 diese Aussage ihres Bekenntnisses so abgeändert: „The claim of any man to be the vicar of Christ and the head of the Church is unscriptural, without warrant in fact, and is a usurpation dishonoring to the Lord Jesus Christ, Matt. 23, 8—10; 1 Pet. 5, 2—4; 2 Thess. 2, 3, 4.“ Aber es handelt sich jetzt nicht um die Frage, wer heute noch glaubt, daß der Papst der rechte Antichrist sei, sondern um die Frage, ob es wahr ist, daß diese Lehre erst im 19. Jahrhundert, unter den Missouriern, aufgefunden ist.

Was hat wohl Calvin in dieser Sache gelehrt? Die zwanzig Kapitel des vierten Buches seiner *Institutio* haben es zumeist mit dem Papsttum zu tun und der 25. Abschnitt des 7. Kapitels mit der Bezeichnung des Papstes als des Antichristen. Nicht „so beiläufig“, sondern *ex professo* gibt Calvin sich damit ab: „To some we seem slanderous and petulant when we call the Roman Pontiff Antichrist.“ (Er verwahrt sich dagegen, daß diese Bezeichnung ihm „in der Hitze des Kampfes“ entfahren sei.) „But those who think so perceive not that they are bringing a charge of intemperance against Paul, after whom we speak, nay, in whose very words we speak.“

(Nicht die Missourier, sondern Paulus hat diese Lehre „aufgebracht“.) „But lest any one object that Paul's words have a different meaning and are wrested by us against the Roman Pontiff, I will briefly show that they can only be understood of the Papacy. Paul says that Antichrist would sit in the temple of God, 2 Thess. 2, 4," etc., etc.

Pfarrer Monnge sagt: „Vergleiche auch die Dogmatik von Pieper.“ Ja, gewiß, Pieper sagt: „die Lehre vom Antichrist gehört nicht zum Fundament der fides salvifica“ (I, S. 102). Die Missourier behandeln diese Sache allerdings als eine Lehre des göttlichen Wortes. Und sie behandeln sie gründlich. Der Abschnitt „Der Antichrist“ weist auf 7½ Seiten nach, daß der Papst der geweisagte Antichrist ist (III, S. 527 ff.). Aber das bildet nicht eine Eigentümlichkeit der missourischen Dogmatik. Charles Hodge verwendet in seiner *Systematic Theology* 22¼ Seiten auf das Thema „Antichrist“ (III, p. 812 ff.). Da findet sich denn auch der bemerkenswerte Satz: „Any future antichrist that may arise must be a small affair compared to the Papacy“ (S. 816). Darüber zum Schluß noch einige Worte. Stahl meint ja, die Reformatoren hätten sich geirrt, als sie annahmen, daß in dem Greuel des Papsttums die Bosheit Satans ihren Gipfelpunkt erreicht habe. Hodge hingegen erklärt, daß, was auch die Zukunft bringen möge, nichts den Greuel des Papsttums erreichen werde noch könne. Pieper drückt das so aus: „Es kann keinen größeren Feind der Kirche Gottes geben als das Papsttum. Die Kirche lebt in der Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und durch dieselbe. . . . Aber das Papsttum mordet nun schon seit einem Jahrtausend immerfort Millionen geistlich, nachdem es sie unter dem Schein der geistlichen Pflege angelockt hat. Woher diese befremdliche und traurige Tatsache, daß fast alle neueren „gläubigen“ Theologen nach dem Antichristen umhersuchen, während derselbe vor ihren Augen groß und mächtig sein Werk in der Kirche hat? Sie stehen nicht in der lebendigen Erkenntnis der Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und der Wichtigkeit dieser Lehre für die Kirche.“ (II, S. 668 ff.) E.

An English Correspondent Publishes an „Open Letter“ of Dr. Dibelius.—The *Manchester Guardian* recently carried the following item sent it by its representative in Germany:—

“Dr. Dibelius, one of the most eminent of modern German Protestant theologians, has addressed an ‘open letter’ to Herr Kerrl, the German Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs. . . . The following are the most important passages:

“The issue [that is to say, the issue in the German religious conflict and more particularly in the coming elections for a new general synod of the Evangelical Church] is one of life and death, and not only for the Evangelical Church, but also, as it seems to me, for the German people. In such a matter every Christian is bound to ask himself if he can do anything so that the worst may perhaps be averted. . . .

“The doctrine that Jesus Christ is the Son of God has not been thought out by men. It is the fundamental revelation of Holy Writ. All our faith depends on this doctrine. From it we derive our hold in this life and our comfort in death. In a time like the present this doctrine is identical with Christianity itself. For if Jesus of Nazareth was a man as we all are, then every one can criticize and alter His teaching. The Sacraments of the Church no longer have a meaning then, nor has the

Church the right then to oppose the gospels as the eternal, unchangeable truth of God to Alfred Rosenberg's "Myth." We would then have been thrust from the bedrock of God's revelation into the quicksands of human opinion and would be helpless in an epoch that recites the praises of new gods. . . .

"Herr Kerl has stated that revelation is a matter of race and blood. Dr. Dibelius replies in his open letter:

"The New Testament says nothing about the will of God being imparted into our blood. It says only one thing — that whatever is in man lies under the curse of self-will and that the will of God is made manifest to man in Jesus Christ, the living Word. The Evangelical pastor is pledged by the vow he took when he was ordained to teach no other doctrine than the doctrine proclaimed in God's clear Word as contained in the Old and New Testaments of Holy Writ. . . .

"You have also said: 'The priests declare that Jesus is a Jew, that they speak of the Jew Paul and say that salvation comes from the Jews. But this will not do. . . .'

"As the attacks of the opponent are now being concentrated on this point all the time, the Church is compelled to answer. Yes, Jesus of Nazareth is, according to his human nature, of the house of David and therefore a Jew. The New Testament tells us this clearly and unmistakably. That Paul was a Jew has never been contested by any one. But to abstain from the letters of the apostle is denied to the Church if the Church does not wish to cease being the Church of Christ. And that salvation comes from the Jews is written in the fourth chapter of the Gospel according to St. John, where Jesus speaks to the Samaritan woman, though it has there a sense very different from what is asserted in the polemics of the Church's enemies, who do not know their Bible. . . .'

"Let me ask you one question, Herr Reichsminister,' proceeds Dr. Dibelius: 'If in the morning's religious instruction the children are told that the Bible is God's Word, which speaks to us in the Old and New Testaments, and when in the afternoon young people have to memorize: "Which is our Bible? Our Bible is Hitler's *Mein Kampf*," who is to change his doctrine here?

"This is the decisive point. When you demand that the Evangelical Church shall not be a state within the state, every Evangelical Christian will agree. The Church must be a church and not a state within the state. But the doctrines which you proclaim would have the effect of making the state into the Church in so far as the state, supported by its coercive powers, comes to decisions with regard to the sermons that are preached and the faith that is confessed.

"Here lies the root of the whole struggle between the state and the Evangelical Church. This struggle will never come to an end as long as the state does not recognize its own frontiers. . . . Hitler's state can count on the service of Evangelical Christians; . . . but as soon as the state endeavors to become Church and to assume power over the souls of men, . . . then we are bound by Luther's word to offer resistance in God's name. And that is what we shall do.'" A.

Book Review — Literatur

Jesus und Paulus — Jesus oder Paulus? Ein Wort an Paulus' Gegner von D. Dr. Johannes Leipoldt, Professor an der Universität Leipzig. Verlag von Dörffling und Franke, Leipzig. 1936. 94 Seiten 6×9. Preis: RM. 3.80, für das Ausland 25 Prozent niedriger.

Es ist dies eine interessante und lehrreiche Schrift. Allerdings wimmelt sie von Dingen, die der, der unser Bibelbuch für Gottes unfehlbares Wort hält, nicht unterschreiben kann; denn der Verfasser ist *toto coelo* davon entfernt, die Schriftlehre von der göttlichen Eingebung der ganzen Heiligen Schrift zu teilen. Auch hätte die Gottheit des Heilandes mehr in den Vordergrund gerückt werden sollen. Aber man kann aus dem Buch, das trotz der nicht großen Seitenzahl wegen des engen Drucks viel Lesestoff bietet und das in mehrfacher Hinsicht konservativ ist, so mancherlei lernen. Der Verfasser bringt hier zusammen, was wir an geschichtlichen Tatsachen über Jesus und Paulus wissen, und zieht eine Parallele. Er selbst bezeichnet im Vorwort den Zweck seiner Schrift also: „Ich gehe von den Unterschieden [zwischen Jesus und Paulus] aus, die vor aller Augen liegen, und suche sie aus der verschiedenen seelischen Haltung, der verschiedenen Umgebung, dem verschiedenen Platz in der Geschichte zu deuten.“ Die Kapitel haben die Überschriften: Die Quellen; Die seelische Entwidlung; Stadt und Dorf; Die Lebenskreise; Erneuerung oder Neugründung; Juden und Griechen; Gott und Gotteskindschaft; Gott und Christus; Gewissheit des Heils; Nachträge. Auch abgesehen von dem schon Genannten wird der Theolog des öfteren ein Fragezeichen an den Rand setzen. Wegen der gegenwärtigen Verhandlungen über die Inspiration ist es interessant zu sehen, was unser Verfasser über Pauli Stellung zur Heiligen Schrift sagt: „Selbstverständlich sind ihm die alttestamentlichen Bücher heilig. Gottes Geist hat sie eingegeben.“ (S. 55.) Auch der letzte Satz der Schrift mag hier eine Stelle finden: „Jesus und Paulus stimmen zusammen, soweit Meister und Jünger, Führer und Gefolgsmann, Schöpfer und Nachgestalter, Heiland und Erlöser überhaupt verglichen werden können.“ W. A r n d t

The Christian View of Man. By J. Gresham Machen. The Macmillan Company, New York. 302 pages, 5¼×8. Price, \$2.50. May be ordered through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

This is perhaps Dr. Machen's last gift to his many fundamentalistic friends, his last witness to the Christian truth as he understood it. *The Christian View of Man* is a companion volume to *Christian Faith in the Modern World*, both of which contain sermons delivered over Station WIP under the auspices of Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia. While the former discourses dealt with the authority of the Bible and the Biblical doctrine of God, those presented here deal with the Biblical doctrine of man, including the related subjects of the decrees of God and predestination. A considerable part of the discussion is concerned with the Biblical doctrine of sin. In the sermons the reader will find Machen at his best, both as a stylist and a controversialist. Dogmatical theology always attracted him, though his proper sphere was that of New Testament exegesis; and in the course of time he became a

scholar of first rank also in doctrinal theology. Together with sound and solid scholarship, Machen possessed literary merits of a high order, so that whatever he wrote is eminently readable because of both the keenness and virility of the thought and the clarity and aptness of the expression. Also Lutheran readers will study these timely radio addresses with pleasure and profit, especially wherever they find themselves on common ground with the author, as, for instance, in his exquisite discourse "Sinners Saved By Grace,"—his final message in the book,—which he concludes with the following stirring words: "Ah, my friends, how precious is that doctrine of the grace of God! It is not in accordance with man's pride. It is not a doctrine that we should ever have evolved. But when it is revealed in God's Word, the hearts of the redeemed cry, Amen. Sinners saved by grace love to ascribe not some, but all of the praise to God." (P.294.) However, in many of the discourses in this volume Machen touches on points where Lutheranism and Calvinism diverge, and here the Lutheran reader will find Machen to be what he always purposed to be—a stout defender of Calvinistic belief as this is set forth in the Westminster Confession. In the preface he writes: "The author believes that the Reformed faith should be preached as well as taught in the classroom and that the need for preaching it is particularly apparent at the present time. The author is trying to preach it in this little book and to preach it especially to the people of our generation." (P. VI.) Yet even so this new book of Dr. Machen is valuable also to Lutherans, for he was an honest man who without any qualification or mental reservation taught in clearest terms what he believed to be the truth. From Machen one can therefore well learn how orthodox Calvinism expresses itself on leading doctrines today. Throughout the book the reader will find rich apologetic material presented by a man whom many regarded as the ablest apologist of our time. To readers who are able to discriminate we recommend this new volume of dogmatico-apologetic addresses most cordially. J. THEODORE MUELLER

The Faith of Christendom. By Dr. J. M. Vander Meulen. Published by Presbyterian Committee of Publications, Richmond, Va. 285 pages, 7¼×5¼. Price, \$1.75.

This book contains fourteen essays (originally presented as addresses) on the fundamental doctrines contained in the Apostles' Creed. It may be called "a fundamentalist's (in a wider sense) defense of Christianity" and is in many ways a refreshing, thought-provoking book. The chapter on the Virgin Birth is both interesting and convincing; those on the Lord's criminal death and His resurrection are overwhelming. One is disappointed, however, in the chapter on the Resurrection of the Body, in which the learned author goes to a great deal of trouble to prove that this article of our faith does not refer to the resurrection of this "identical body." This seems to be too great a miracle, and the author does not strengthen his position with this explanation of Luke 24, 36—43: "In this passage Jesus said to His disciples: 'Behold My hands and My feet, that it is I Myself; handle Me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see Me have.' This is on any account a very difficult passage of interpretation. It might seem to negative all that we have said

about the resurrection body not being one of flesh and blood. We are to remember, however, that, while there are some likenesses between the resurrection body of Jesus and our resurrection body, there is this one difference: that our fleshly bodies will be decayed when the resurrection takes place. This was not true of Jesus. One of two things therefore must have happened in His case: either there was a gradual transformation from His fleshly body into a spiritual one during the days He still remained on earth, or, otherwise, there was something like what the London Psychic Research Society means by materialism—the ability to project a material body . . . and withdraw it again.” However, in spite of these and other passages with which one cannot agree this volume may be recommended.

W. G. POLACK

The Church and the Social Problem. Lecture delivered at the meeting of the Lutheran World Convention, Paris, 1935. By Dr. M. Reu. The Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, O. 46 pages, 7½×5¼. Price, 25 cts. Order from Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

Editor C. C. Morrison of the *Christian Century* ought to buy this tract. He declared some time ago that “the traditional Lutheran attitude has been one of deliberate withdrawal from the whole field of social action into the narrow limits of what it calls the ‘spiritual.’” The truth is that the Lutheran Church works for social betterment with all the forces at her command; she considers her duty toward society a “spiritual” duty; and back of her work in this direction lies all her spiritual force, the full power of her glorious “spiritual” doctrines. Where a particular congregation does not employ its full force in this direction, it denies the spirit of the Lutheran Church. Let us hear Dr. Reu: “What is the right position of the Church toward the solution of the social question? In the first place, the Church must understand the condition of the people concerned, the representatives of capital as well as of labor, . . . must realize the terrible magnitude of modern social evils. . . .” Then, in the second place, “the Church must go on to action. Her first great sphere of action is in the field of healing love, to heal as many wounds as she possibly can. A great field is open to inner missions, not only in institutional work, but far more in other activities. . . .” “In the third place, the Church must help create a better social order.” Yes, that is good Lutheran doctrine. Of course, according to good Lutheran doctrine “to institute or change the forms of economic organization is exclusively the right of the State. The Church does not support a specific economic reform to the exclusion of others. . . . She must guard against considering one form absolute over against another and against compelling the State to introduce it. . . . She will gladly permit the State to decide which is the best way to improve living conditions.” It is not the business of the Church to introduce “religious socialism, to Christianize the State and with its help to create a perfect social order.” Then what can the Church do to create a better social order? “The Church as a whole will do well if she is careful and limits herself, fearlessly and insistently, to teach the basic ethical principles, especially the equality of those concerned and the justice which condemns as sinful the selfishness

of the owners as well as of the workers. . . . *The Church must send out of her midst into the social order people with an awakened conscience.* . . . She helps advance the nation when she makes men Christians, who in their positions through word and deed foster social justice. The Church must send them," but remember, "not in order to establish a Christian social order. That dare not even be the aim." And now, fourth, for "the most important contribution of the Church to the social question. It is the establishment of a God-pleasing social order in her own midst. . . . The Church must exemplify Luther's words 'Every one is created and born for his neighbor,' and 'Everything we have must be ready to serve. If it does not serve, it is robbery.' . . . In the measure that the Church ceases to strive to establish a God-pleasing social order in her own midst, she refuses to do what will help most to solve the social question." These are familiar Lutheran principles. Back in 1896 Dr. Pieper wrote: "Men object here: Is Christianity to be without influence on 'the social life'? . . . Christianity makes all things new, also in the political sphere; influences politics most decidedly *by making honest, conscientious politicians.* Christianity makes honest and conscientious politicians just as it makes honest and conscientious shoemakers and merchants. . . . By confining herself strictly to her sphere as Church and devoting herself entirely to her sphere of duty, she best serves, mediately, the cause of civil government, of social and other reforms. . . . Luther: 'First fill the world with true Christians, before you try to introduce a Christian, evangelical government. But that you will never accomplish.'" (Lehre und Wehre, 42, p. 193 ff.) That is the Lutheran attitude; read up in Luther, according to the references given by Reu and Pieper. We imagine that Dr. Morrison will now want his money back. He has found that the Lutheran Church is not ready to engage in whatever current reform the *Christian Century* is just now advocating (a while ago it was Dr. Kagawa's Cooperatives). But his charge was that the Lutheran Church withdraws herself from the *whole field of social action*. The truth is that she charges all her pastors and congregations to "realize the terrible magnitude of modern social evils" and then to "go on to action." Those Lutherans who may have taken a neutral, indifferent position in this matter should buy this booklet, which Dr. Morrison does not care to own.—We also read the introduction to the booklet, furnished by the translator. We wonder what Dr. Reu thought when he read it. He certainly does not agree with the un-Lutheran ideas on "unity" vented by the writer of the introduction. TH. ENGELDER

The Inspiration of the Scriptures. By Loraine Boettner. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. 1937. 88 pages, 5¼×7¼. Price, \$1.00.

The author is well known for his conservative Calvinism, which appears, for example, in his book *The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination* and in many articles from his pen. The present monograph, although by no means comprehensive and exhaustive, is a splendid contribution to the literature appearing in defense of the verbal and plenary inspiration of the Bible. The subject is treated in six chapters: Introduction; The Writers Claim Inspiration; The Nature of the Influence by which

Inspiration is Accomplished; The Alleged Errors in Scripture; The Trustworthiness of the Bible; The Plenary Inspiration of the Bible. For general use the book is marred by an invidious distinction between the Reformed doctrine and that of other church-bodies, a distinction which is frequently so strong as to become obtrusive and disturbing, as when the author states: "If we have a trustworthy Scripture as our guide, . . . we shall have a Calvinistic, as distinguished from an Arminian, Lutheran, or Unitarian system; for we find the Evangelical, Calvinistic system of theology clearly taught in the Bible." (P. 16.) And again: "The distinctive doctrines of the Christian system, . . . stated perhaps more accurately and clearly in the Westminster Confession of Faith than in any other creed." (P. 17.) Again: "The Reformed have truly grappled with these problems." (P. 45.) The same spirit appears elsewhere (pp. 80, 86). This fact mars an otherwise praiseworthy contribution to the problem of inspiration.

P. E. KRETZMANN

Looking into Life. By Paul M. Tharp. The Bible Institute Colportage Association, Chicago, Ill. 5½×8. Price, 75 cts. May be ordered through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

This is a book which we cheerfully recommend. The author speaks of the world as it is *today*, and shows that man, who is still by nature a sinner, must, if he would be saved and fulfil his mission in this world, put his trust in Christ, his Savior, and be guided by the Word of God. The book offers many suggestions to the preacher in reference to the needs of the people whom the Lord has entrusted to his care. The following quotations from the book will give the reader an idea of the contents: "So in every age, while the worldly-wise grope in the darkness of unbelief, the children of God, possessors of intelligent faith in the living God, have light in their dwellings; it is the light of divine truth, divinely revealed and recorded in the Holy Bible." (P. 13.) "That Book is the inspired and infallible Word of God." (P. 19.) "The right start in youth means everything in the race of life. Misguidance here may result in thwarting life's whole purpose. The only way to be certain that one is guiding these young minds aright is to point them to God and His Christ." (P. 14.) "While the god of this world is in charge of the affairs of this present evil world, the nations will be filled with pride and rebellion and will continue in war and the shedding of blood. The League of Nations will be met with perpetual chagrin because of its impotency, for it shall never be able to contravene the subtle operations of the 'prince of the power of the air.' That task must be reserved for the 'Prince of Peace.'" (P. 55.) "The doctrine of 'the new woman' in her brazen boasts of equality with man, seeing that she despises her birthright, her Christian heritage of superiority, honor, and respect; with her new code of low-gage morality and its attending evils: smoking, swearing, drinking, ganging, and murdering, is a serious threat against the home. Instead of maintaining her place of equality with man, she has sunk very low and taken man down with her. In her pretense at rising to greater liberty she is ensnared in a bondage that is a thousand times worse than that from which she seeks to escape; it is a bondage

to sin, self, and sensual pleasure." (P. 66.) "One often hears the fact lamented that there are so few really great men today. Why? We cannot have great men without great mothers." (P. 67.) "One of the most humiliating features of the great depression has been its spectacular demonstration of the apostate and worldly condition of so many preachers and their parishes. Of course, the condition existed before, but it seemed less in evidence when everything was moving along prosperously. When the real test came, the real truth came out more prominently, revealing the awful fact and fruits of paganism (Modernism, so-called) in the Church." (P. 69.) "To a very great extent the typical modern church was and is incapacitated for rendering any real, effective, spiritual service. It is itself quite ill with a nausea of prayerlessness, powerlessness, and worldliness. It is a church of much worldliness and little worship, much sociability and little spirituality, much play and little prayer, much banqueting and little blessing." (P. 70.) "The fact that Jesus suggests a remedy seems to imply that the case is not hopeless; but He definitely emphasizes the fact that the only hope there is, is the hope that is reposed in Himself. The church of today needs the tried gold of His deity; it needs to discard its own filthy rags of self-righteousness and be clothed in the white raiment of His righteousness; it needs its blind eyes opened by the anointing with the eye-salve of spiritual illumination which is supplied and applied by the Holy Spirit. Only by His indwelling can the overcharged heart be restored to its normal function." (P. 72.) We have given these quotations to induce the preacher to purchase the book itself and receive the stimulus it will give him for his own personal life and for the work which he is called to do. We can accept almost all of the statements made by the author.

J. H. C. FARR

A History of the Christian Church. By Lars P. Qualben, St. Olaf College. Second, revised and enlarged edition. Thomas Nelson and Sons, New York. 1936. 644 pages. Price, \$2.50. May be ordered through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

This is the new edition of Professor Qualben's *Church History*. The fact that a new edition was necessary in so short a time (it was first published in 1933) is surely the best recommendation. And it deserves recommendation. What was said in the review of the first edition (CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY, V, 330) is herewith reiterated: it is still the best text-book on church history on the market. The new edition is enlarged by 54 pages, distributed on the section on the Middle Ages, and three entirely new chapters: one on the Church in Canada, one on Christian missions, and one on Church Unity. We could have done without the last chapter; most of its contents had been said before; new is only an attempt to defend unionism by a strange application of Bible parables. — Some of the errors in the first edition were removed in this; some still remain. Boniface VIII was no longer in the French king's prison when he died (p. 189); but a lack in the first edition was supplied in the footnote on the *Unam Sanctam*. Luther's chief motive for posting the Ninety-five Theses was not to protest against the indulgence method of gathering money (p. 233); his parishioners believed that they were

buying forgiveness of sins from Tetzl; correctly this popular belief is referred to on p. 215. The reason why Luther consented to the League of Smalcald is, I think, incorrectly given on p. 275: "The princes and the free cities constituted the government to which the Christians concerned owed their allegiance. The emperor was elected by the princes, *not by God.*" No; both were government by divine right; but in the feudal establishment in Germany, powers and rights and duties were divided; and when the emperor persecuted the subjects of a prince, he overstepped his rights, and it was the prince's duty to defend his subjects even against the emperor. The date of the suppression of the Jesuits is incorrectly given as 1573 (p. 342); should be 1773. — Appearance and binding are improved; the low price remains the same. — For every chapter a brief, but, on the whole, well-selected bibliography is given, a feature which makes the book valuable as a guide for private study of church history.

THEO. HOYER

The Gospel of the Cross. A Second Series of Sermons by Karl Heim, Ph.D. Translated by John Schmidt, B.D., Pastor of Augsburg Lutheran Church, Detroit, Mich. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. 168 pages, 5¼×8. Price, \$1.00.

Doctor Heim is the well-known professor of Systematic Theology in the University of Tuebingen. The sermons which are here offered in a fluent translation were delivered in German, in 1930 and 1931. Their form is that of the customary Lutheran sermon, with theme and parts usually announced before the body of the sermon. They are expository in nature and doctrinal in content. The exposition is sound, the illustrations striking and appropriate, the application straightforward and fitting, the thoughts stimulating. The author touches upon many subjects, even upon the liturgical movement. He states: "We have today a movement in our Church which is seeking to create liturgical services that shall be emotionally fruitful and artistically complete. Who is there that would not applaud this purpose? And yet, when we see into the mirror of the Word, into this frank mirror that reveals our true nature, we are frightened by that which the Bible repeatedly says of a worship that does not result in action." (P. 136.) The book abounds in passages of this type and is well worthy of careful study.

P. E. KRETZMANN

He Is Able. By W. E. Sangster. Cokesbury Press, Nashville, Tenn. 199 pages, 5¼×7¾. Price, \$1.50.

"In vivid phraseology and with frequent and apt illustration the author shows the Spirit of Christ at work in the daily lives of the perplexed, struggling, often defeated, but in the end triumphant, transfigured men and women." So we read in the publishers' statement found on the bookcover. If Christ were merely the teacher and example, and if by His teaching and example He could save men, then we would subscribe to every word said. Unfortunately the author knows no more, at least says no more, of Christ than that He is Example and Teacher and therefore Savior. He brings out in choice language and gripping illustrations the power of Christ's example. Yet nowhere in the entire book

have we found a clear statement that no man can really follow Christ's example and precept, as Christ would have him follow them, unless he has accepted Christ as his Savior through faith in His vicarious sacrifice on Calvary. This is the chief fault of this book, and a grievous fault.

TH. LAETSCH

Pro Ecclesia Lutherana. December MCMXXXVI. Also: **The Music of the Ordinary.** Published by the Liturgical Society of St. James. New York. 32 plus 10 pages, 7×10½.

This report contains the papers delivered at the late 1936 meeting of the society and is now offered in planographed form. The following subjects are treated: The Propriety of Symbolism and Ceremony; Suggested Forms for the Funeral Service (strongly high-church); A Suggested Form for Baptism (with exorcism); The Common Service (concluded); A Catechism of the Common Service.

P. E. KRETZMANN

Proceedings of the Nineteenth Convention of the Central Illinois District of the Ev. Luth. Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States. 1936.

These *Proceedings*, printed as a number of the *Central Illinois District Lutheran* and sold at the price of 25 cents, contain a paper by Professor M. H. Coyner on the important topic "The Christian Home." The paper deserves to be read throughout our Synod.

W. ARNDT

Gingegangene Literatur

Luthertum für April bringt außer einigen interessanten „Randbemerkungen“ von Hans Schomerus und Bergbolts „Zeitschriften und Bücherbericht“ einen längeren Artikel von Johannes Smemo (Professor an der Gemeindefakultät Oslo) über „Theozentrität und Seelsorge bei Paulus“.

Das Januarheft der pädagogischen Zeitschrift *Schule und Evangelium* bietet einen feinen Auszug aus Luthers Auslegung des 23. Psalms, zusammengestellt von O. Biegner, und mehrere Artikel, die das Verhältnis des Nationalsozialismus zur Kirche und Schule darlegen. Im Aprilheft findet sich ein Auszug aus Luthers Auslegung des 25. Psalms und ein Artikel: „Was sagt die Bibel über die irdische Arbeit des Menschen?“ Bezugspreis dieser Zeitschrift ist jährlich M. 6, und der Verleger ist J. F. Steinkopf in Stuttgart.

The Christian Parent. Vol. I, No. 1. Published by the Rev. Martin P. Simon, M. A., 1065 Ferry St., Eugene, Oregon. Subscription price, 40 cts. a year.

NOTICE TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS

In order to render satisfactory service, we must have our current mailing-list correct. The expense of maintaining this list has been materially increased. Under present regulations we are subject to a "fine" on all parcels mailed to an incorrect address. Inasmuch as we must pay 2 cents for every notification sent by the postmaster on a parcel or periodical which is undeliverable because no forwarding address is available or because there has been a change of address. This may seem insignificant, but in view of the fact that we have subscribers getting three or more of our periodicals and considering our large aggregate subscription list, it may readily be seen that it amounts to quite a sum during a year; for the postmaster will address a notification to each individual periodical. Our subscribers can help us by notifying us — one notification (postal card, costing only 1 cent) will take care of the addresses for several publications. We shall be very grateful for your cooperation.

Kindly consult the address label on this paper to ascertain whether your subscription has expired or will soon expire. "July 37" on the label means that your subscription has expired. Please pay your agent or the Publisher promptly in order to avoid interruption of service. It takes about two weeks before the address label can show change of address or acknowledgment of remittance.

When paying your subscription, please mention name of publication desired and exact name and address (both old and new, if change of address is requested).

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, St. Louis, Mo.